P

B. H. BLACKWELL LTD.

A course of Lectures delivered in 1923 at Jews' College, London, under the auspices of the Union of Jewish Literary Societies

---

JEWISH HISTORY IN THE FIRST CENTURY
By the Rev. A. Cohen, M.A., Ph.D.

THE APOCALYPSES: THEIR PLACE IN JEWISH HISTORY
By F. C. Burkitt, F.B.A., D.D.

THE JEWS OF BABYLON
By Elkan Nathan Adler, M.A.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PHARISAISM
By the Rev. R. Travers Herford, B.A.

JOSEPHUS
By H. St. John Thackeray, M.A., D.D.

JUDAISM AND THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY

Judaism and the Beginnings of Christianity

A course of Lectures delivered in 1923 at Jews' College, London, under the auspices of the Union of Jewish Literary Societies

LIBRARY OF
Rochester Theological Seminary
BM177
U6
22,776

LONDON
GEORGE ROUTLEDGE & SONS, LTD.
BROADWAY HOUSE, 68-74, CARTER LANE, E.C.

Printed in Great Britain by MACKAYS LTD., Chatham.

PREFACE

THE five chapters of this volume comprise the five Lectures of a course on *Jewish History in the First Century*, which were arranged by the Union of Jewish Literary Societies and delivered, during the early part of 1923, before large audiences at Jews' College in London. Soon after their delivery, numerous requests were received by the Council for the publication of these Lectures, so that they might not only be read by those who had heard them, but reach a still larger public who realised the importance of the subject and the exceptional qualifications of the lecturers. The Council of the Union gladly adopted this suggestion, and wish to take this opportunity of expressing their gratitude to the lecturers who most generously allowed the Union to make free use of their addresses for the purpose. To one of us (L.H.) fell the task of organizing this course of Lectures; to the other (C.S.M.) that of seeing them through the Press.

CHARLES S. MYERS,
President, 1921–3.

LIZZIE HANDS,
Hon. Secretary,
Union of Jewish Literary Societies.

November, 1923.

CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE v

I. JEWISH HISTORY IN THE FIRST CENTURY 1
By the Rev. A. Cohen, M.A., Ph.D.
Minister, Birmingham Hebrew Congregation.

II. THE APOCALYPSES: THEIR PLACE IN JEWISH HISTORY 49
By F. C. Burkitt, F.B.A., D.D.
Norrisian Professor of Divinity, University of Cambridge.

III. THE JEWS OF BABYLON . . . 91
By Elkan Nathan Adler, M.A.

IV. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PHARISAISM . 125
By the Rev. R. Travers Herford, B.A.
Author of "Pharisaism, its Aims and Methods," etc.

V. JOSEPHUS. 167
By H. St. John Thackeray, M.A., D.D.

LECTURE I

JEWISH HISTORY IN THE FIRST CENTURY

(Introductory Lecture)

BY

The REV. A. COHEN, M.A., Ph.D.,
Minister, Birmingham Hebrew Congregation

JEWISH HISTORY IN THE FIRST CENTURY

(INTRODUCTORY LECTURE)

The first point which presents itself for consideration when dealing with any historical epoch is the question of limits. Which year is to be selected as the starting-point, and which event is to mark the close of the period? History does not arrange itself symmetrically in centuries for our convenience; and after all, a century is purely an arbitrary division of time having no relationship to the course of events. In his recent book on " British History in the 19th Century," Trevelyan finds himself compelled to go back as far as 1782 for the opening of his narrative, and he rings down the curtain on the death of Queen Victoria in 1901. It will be similarly impossible for us to keep our story strictly within the years 1 and 99 of the present era, and there is no valid reason why we should do so. The current era is computed

on a system of chronology which is now recognised to be incorrect. It was a 6th-century monk who fixed the Roman year 754 as the year 1 of the Christian era. Although the exact year of the birth of Christianity's founder is still a matter of uncertainty, it is agreed that it was earlier than the year 1. Many authorities are of the opinion that it happened in the year 6 B.C.E. However this may be, it would be meaningless to treat the years of the first century as self-contained. During that period there was reaped on the Holy Land a grim harvest; but the seeds had been sown long before. To gain a proper understanding of the tragic drama which was enacted in Judea during the latter half of the first century, we shall have to refer back to the first and even the second century B.C.E.

It will be generally conceded that the period which forms the subject of this series of lectures is one of the greatest turning points in Jewish History, if not the most critical of all. At the dawn of the first century C.E., Judea, to external appearance, was in a strong, healthy condition. True, the people did not enjoy independence. They paid tribute to Rome; but there

was compensation in the fact that dread of the mighty mistress secured a measure of safety for the nations who bent the knee to her. Graetz writes: "Herod's rule was at all events distinguished by external splendour, and by a certain amount of animation in the direction of public affairs. The boundaries of Judea now extended far beyond the limits assigned to them in the most prosperous days of the Hasmoneans . . . The towns of Judea had been restored with great magnificence, they were adorned with beautiful specimens of Greek sculpture and architecture . . . The seaports, and especially the port of Caesarea, were crowded with shipping."* In addition, we have to note that the people were free to observe their religious rites. They had their Temple in Jerusalem, recently rebuilt with unstinted munificence by Herod, which, for architectural splendour and richness of decoration, far surpassed its two predecessors. But as with the Temple, so with the State, the glittering exterior concealed roots of corruption which were to produce decay and death.

At the close of the century we find the Temple

* *History of the Jews*, Eng. trans. II. ch. v (Am. Ed. p. 118).

in ruins, the land desolate, the bulk of the population banished into slavery. A historical period which presents so startling a transformation cannot but be full of stirring incident; nor can it fail to provide food for reflection. If Emerson was right in stating, "The use of history is to give value to the present hour and its duty,"* if there be a didactic purpose in historical study, then I doubt whether any other century is so replete with interest and instruction for the Jew as is the first. It gives rise to two questions of outstanding importance: (1) What were the causes of the downfall of Temple and State? (2) How did the Jewish people survive a catastrophe which, in all probability, would have sounded the death-knell of any other nation and brought about its extinction? It is with these two questions that this Introductory Lecture will attempt to deal.

There is a well-known Rabbinical saying, "Over a quarrel between Kamtsa and Bar Kamtsa was Jerusalem destroyed."† It is usually understood as pointing the moral that internal dissensions and fratricidal schisms

* From Essay on "Works and Days"; see also his Essay on "History."

† Gittin 55b.

within the body of the Jewish nation were the immediate cause of the overwhelming disaster that brought it to the dust. That is only too true. The picture which Josephus draws of the conditions in the Holy City while it was besieged by the Romans—of a divided population, mutually suspicious and hostile, unwilling to sink personal differences in the face of a common enemy—that picture may be accepted as correct. And if in the *dénouement* of the national drama we plainly detect this evil as a main contributory cause in the defeat, when we turn back a hundred years to the opening act of the tragedy we discover the same *motif* forcing itself upon our attention. We see two brothers fighting for the throne of Judea.

On the death of the widow of Alexander Jannaeus in the year 69 B.C.E., the Jews were enjoying independence. Not only was there no overlord to exact tribute, but the Hasmonean kings, John Hyrcanus I. and Alexander Jannaeus, had been free to indulge in a campaign of imperialistic expansion. They conducted wars of conquest for the sole purpose of enlarging the boundaries of their kingdom; and they were both guilty of the crime of forcing

a gentile population to accept Judaism, not from a motive of religious zeal, but to incorporate these tribes more easily into the Judean kingdom.* They followed the same policy as Antiochus Epiphanes; but unfortunately these peoples produced no leaders like the Maccabees who resisted the attempt at enforced proselytisation. Among the peoples to yield to this pressure were the Idumeans, whose acceptance of Judaism was very nearly to cause its destruction.

The death of the Queen marked the beginning of the end of Judea's independence. She left two sons; but by one of the chance accidents which are often so fateful in the destinies of peoples, it was the younger who possessed the real qualities of kingship. If Aristobulus had been the elder son, Jewish history would probably have run a different course. I do not believe that Judea would have altogether escaped the unwelcome attention of Rome; but I doubt whether its yoke would have pressed so heavily on the Jews as to lead to a revolt. Fate unkindly decreed that the lawful heir to the throne should be Hyrcanus, a man of weak

* Josephus, *Antiquities* xiii. 9 1; *ibid.* 15. 4.

character and irresolute will. The dying Queen had bequeathed the crown to her elder son. Aristobulus, anticipating that he would be passed over in the succession, prepared his plans while his mother was still alive. He had his army ready; and immediately after her death he marched on Jerusalem and defeated his brother. They mutually agreed that Aristobulus should be king, and Hyrcanus High Priest.

Hyrcanus would have been quite content with this arrangement. He had no personal ambitions. All might have been well; but Nemesis found here an opportunity of avenging the wrong which had been done by the Hasmonean kings. A member of the Idumean race, forced to adopt Judaism, appeared on the scene in the person of a crafty schemer named Antipater who became Hyrcanus' friend and chief counsellor. In the hands of this able but unscrupulous adviser Hyrcanus was like clay. He had neither mind nor will of his own. Bribed by a promise of the restoration of territory wrested from his people by the Hasmoneans, Aretas, king of Nabatea, was induced by Antipater to espouse the cause of Hyrcanus. At the head of

a considerable army he laid siege to Jerusalem, and a bitter struggle began. It was brought to an end by a fatal step taken by both brothers, *viz.* the reference of their dispute for arbitration to Scaurus, Pompey's legate, who chanced to be in the neighbourhood. Each party sought to purchase the Roman's support by gifts; but whereas Aristobulus' ambassador brought gold, the envoy of Hyrcanus could only bring promises. This difference, added to the fact that he thought it to the interest of Rome to have the Nabateans out of Judea, made Scaurus decide in favour of the younger brother. Hyrcanus' ally was ordered to raise the siege of Jerusalem. For two years Aristobulus reigned unchallenged—at least openly; but all the while Antipater was steadily undermining his position. He wormed his way into the favour of Pompey, who was campaigning in the neighbouring country of Syria, and persuaded him to re-open the question of the Judean kingship. Pompey summoned the brothers to appear before him in person at Damascus, a command which they obeyed—in itself an admission of subservience to Rome. So wearied were many of the people of this

civil strife, that a Republican party sprang up which sent a delegation to Damascus, requesting that the monarchy should be abolished. Thus the question of Judea's government was placed in the hands of the Roman General. Pompey quickly saw through the characters of the two contestants, and recognised that it would be preferable for Rome to have the weakling as the Jewish ruler. At the same time he understood that it would not be prudent to antagonise the rash but able Aristobulus. He therefore procrastinated, and delayed giving his decision. Aristobulus was keen-witted enough to read Pompey's thoughts. He hurriedly left Damascus to protect his interests and repaired to the fortress of Alexandrion.

Pompey saw here his opportunity. He declared war on Aristobulus and marched his army across the Jordan. Aristobulus retreated to Jerusalem, and Pompey followed. Once again the Holy City had to submit to the horrors of a siege. In the summer of 63, a breach was made and the Roman legions stormed the Temple. This was the end of Jewish independence. With his soldiers in possession of Jerusalem Pompey could now adjudicate the

dispute which had been brought to him. His decision was: the abolition of the kingship, the appointment of Hyrcanus to the office of High Priest, and of Antipater as governor of the country; Judea was to be regarded as a conquered province of Rome and subject to tribute. Its territory was also reduced to the dimensions prior to the Hasmonean conquests. Aristobulus and his family formed part of Pompey's triumphal procession on his return to Rome.

The grip which the Romans had thus obtained over Judea was strengthened when, in the year 40, the Senate proclaimed Antipater's son, Herod, as king of the Jews. It was not until three years later that he was able to ascend the throne, and then only by the aid of Roman legions. Detested by his subjects as one alien to their race, he clearly perceived that his only chance of retaining his position was by complete submission to Rome. Throughout his reign, his chief thought was to curry favour with his Emperor. He introduced Roman customs and institutions into his country, and even erected a Roman temple on its soil.* Non-Jewish in origin, un-Jewish in

* *Antiquities* XV. 8. 1, 5.

thought and feeling, Herod's interest in Judaism and Jewry was always of secondary concern. He allowed the bonds of Rome to grow tighter and tighter on the life of the country. He was succeeded by his son, Archelaus, who was deposed by the request of his subjects in the year 6 C.E., and the dynasty, except for a brief revival later on, was dissolved. Judea ceased to be a separate State, and became only a part of the province of Syria, governed by a Roman procurator.

I have dwelt at some length on this unhappy story, although the whole of it up to the end of Herod's reign occurred before the opening of the first century, because it is of greater decisiveness in the fate of Jewry than anything that happened until the destruction of the Temple by Titus. The history of the 74 years between Herod's death and the national collapse is but the inevitable sequel to the events I have narrated. The State was doomed in the year 1; it was merely a question of how long would elapse before the Roman tyranny would grow intolerable upon the Jewish masses, and an effort be made to break it. I do not propose to tell the stirring narrative of that heroic but

forlorn attempt to regain national freedom. That will probably be done in the lecture on Josephus, whose life is so intimately interwoven into the history of the period. I wish rather to examine with you further the causes which contributed to the downfall of Temple and State.

If we turn back to the seventh decade in the first century B.C.E., and study the initial quarrel between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, we are forced to the conclusion that their dispute might not have had so fatal a result, were it not for the fact that the people themselves were split into two rival parties—the Pharisees and Sadducees. A united nation would, in all probability, have successfully solved the problem of the succession to the throne; but the Sadducean party upheld the claim of Aristobulus while the Pharisees supported Hyrcanus. Throughout the subsequent history we find this constant antagonism between the two factions causing unrest and reducing the vitality of the State. It was without doubt a prominent factor in determining the fate of the nation, and deserves to be considered in this connection. The precise origin of these sects

is wrapped in obscurity, and different scholars advance different theories. We are not even sure what the names "Pharisee" and "Sadducee" mean. Perhaps Mr. Travers Herford, the ablest non-Jewish exponent of Pharisaism, may deal with the problem in the lecture he is to give in this series.

For our purpose we shall find a convenient starting-point in an event which occurred on the 28th of Elul, 140 B.C.E., when Simon, the last of the Maccabean brothers, who until then had held the office of High Priest, was acclaimed by the people as *Nāsī*, "prince." He was not given the title of "king," because he was not a descendant of David; but for all practical purposes he was the first Jewish monarch since the destruction of the first Temple, and he issued coins bearing his name. His successors did not scruple to call themselves by the royal title. The restoration of the monarchy, judging from its harmful effects in Biblical times, was an unwise step; but to combine secular power and the High Priesthood in one person was fatal alike to the Temple and the Jewish State. The two offices were quite incompatible, the ideals of the one being fundamentally different from

the other. It invested the priesthood with the glamour of wealth and worldly power, which alienated it from the sympathies, the respect and the attachment of the mass of the people. The old ideal of the priestly vocation, enunciated by the prophet Malachi, was abandoned: "The lips of a priest should keep knowledge and the Law should they seek from his mouth; for he is a messenger of the Lord of Hosts."* The Pentateuch had wisely ordained that the priests should have no possession in the land: "The Lord is their inheritance."† Simon went to the other extreme in accepting the dual office, which took the priesthood from the Sanctuary and closely associated it with the extravagance and corruption frequently to be found in a royal palace. The deterioration of the priests is often referred to in the Apocalyptic literature with which Professor Burkitt is to deal. I shall quote only one passage from "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," which describes their condition in the reign of Alexander Jannaeus, Simon's grandson. They are accused of "deceiving Israel, and stirring up against it great evils from the Lord. And ye deal lawlessly

* *Malachi* ii. 7. † *Deuteronomy* x. 6; xviii. 2.

together with Israel, so He shall not bear with Jerusalem because of your wickedness; but the veil of the temple shall be rent so as not to cover your shame. And ye shall be scattered as captives among the gentiles and shall be for a reproach and for a curse there."* The immorality of the priestly caste is then severely denounced: "The offerings of the Lord ye rob and from His portion ye steal choice portions, eating them contemptuously with harlots. Wedded women ye pollute and the virgins of Jerusalem ye defile . . . and the daughters of the gentiles ye take to wife."† Their arrogance and irreligious spirit are then referred to in bitter tones: "Ye are puffed up because of your priesthood, lifting yourselves up against men, and not only so, but also against the commands of God. For ye contemn the holy things with jests and laughter."

I have related to you how this unholy union between the monarchy and High Priesthood was dissolved by Pompey; but the mischief was already done. The office had lost its sanctity in the eyes of the majority of the people. It became an object of barter, and the centre of

* *Testament of Levi* x, 2 ff. ‡ *Ibid.* xiv. 5f.

intrigue. After the deposition of Archelaus, the appointment of the High Priest was in the hands of the Roman Procurator, who could also remove him at will. Josephus informs us that during the 107 years from the accession of Herod to the destruction of the Temple, there were no fewer than 28 High Priests, *i.e.*, the average tenure of the office was slightly under four years.* This fact alone is sufficient evidence that the High Priest was nothing more than a tool of the Roman Governor and had to do his bidding or forfeit his position. Some of the occupants met with a violent end. The High Priesthood was upheld by the aristocratic families in Judea, and this party is denoted by the term Sadducees. There were certain theological questions which divided them from the Pharisees, but their main difference was of a social and political character. The Pharisees, who included the mass of the population, were scandalised by the depravity and un-Jewishness of the priesthood; and although the Temple, as an institution, remained sacred in their eyes and they scrupulously paid their dues to the upkeep of its services, yet were they compelled by the

* *Antiquities* xx. 10. 1.

force of circumstances to develop a theory of Judaism which, to a degree, made it independent of the Sanctuary, or at any rate not completely and integrally identified with it. We thus arrive at the paradoxical conclusion that whereas, on the one hand, the dissensions between Pharisees and Sadducees contributed to the downfall of Temple and State, they, on the other hand, had much to do with softening the deadliness of the blow, and helped the Jewish people and Judaism to survive that cataclysmic event.

If the people had all been of one religious party, and if their religion had been as centred in the Temple as was that of the Sadducees, I do not think it can be questioned that, humanly speaking, Judaism would never have recovered from the shock of the Temple reduced to ruins. The very basis of the religious life would have collapsed, and the Jews would have been entirely at a loss to find anything upon which to build an enduring Jewish structure. As though they acted from a premonition of what was to occur, the leaders of the Pharisaic party had been preparing the people for a Temple-less Judaism. They gradually shifted the centre

of gravity of the Jewish Religion from the Temple to the Torah.* It would not be true to say that this strong emphasis on Torah was something quite new in the first century. It was much older than that. It is very noticeable in the age of Ezra. But it was the Pharisaic teachers who concentrated upon the study of Torah to a degree unknown before. They made it the alpha and omega of Jewish duty, the fountain of Jewish inspiration, the source of discipline and the well of hope. Read through the first chapter of the *Pirke Aboth*, and the insistence upon the obligation to study will be found most striking. Whereas Simon the Just, who lived in the fourth or third century B.C.E. (we are not sure which) declared: "Upon three things the world—*i.e.*, the world of Judaism—is based: upon the Torah, upon the Temple service, and upon the practice of charity," not a single one of the early Rabbis, whose aphorisms are mentioned in that chapter, refers to the Temple. Instead of that, we find such teachings as: "Let thy house be a meeting-house for the wise; sit amidst the dust

* 'Torah' means the *corpus* of Jewish teaching, regulative of every phase of life, which, rooted in the Hebrew Scriptures, developed and grew from age to age.

of their feet, and drink their words with thirst;" "Whoso engages in much gossip with women brings evil upon himself and neglects the study of Torah"; "Provide thyself a teacher"; "He who does not increase his knowledge decreases it"; "Fix a period for thy study of Torah." This attitude was later on crystallised in the famous parable of R. Akiba who declared that Torah is the life-element of the Jew as water is the life-element of the fishes.

In this extraordinary prominence given to Torah-study, we have a new phenomenon in Jewish life, and it was a direct outcome of the difference between Sadducee and Pharisee. The former did not neglect the Law; but his interpretation was strictly *au pied de la lettre*. The Torah was written down for him in the sacred Scriptures; its meaning was on the surface. Its injunctions were fixed and immutable. Judaism, as he conceived it, was a stereotyped, hide-bound system, committed to writing, and incapable of being altered in the smallest detail. It may be true that times change, that conditions alter, that what is suitable for one age is not so for a later age—that could not be helped: Jewish law was, is, and must ever be the same.

In a word, the religious attitude of the Sadducee was rigidly conservative. It will be obvious that had this principle prevailed among the Jewish people, they would have been utterly unprepared for the violent change in circumstances which was brought into being by the destruction of the Temple. The conditions of the religious life had completely and fundamentally altered; and those new conditions could never have been fitted into a hide-bound system. What was required to meet the emergency was precisely what the Pharisees offered. According to their viewpoint, the words of Torah were but seeds, which, when carefully tended, blossomed and grew in instructiveness. They found in the laws of the Scriptures not so much unalterable enactments, but principles of action which yielded guidance for the ever-changing conditions of life. The Rabbis were progressive, forward-looking men; and they insisted upon the necessity of an Oral Law to make the Written Law adaptable to the facts of daily existence. In their hands, Jewish religious law became a thing of infinite flexibility, a system which paid regard to, and made provision for, the need of each age. Thus it was

that when the blow fell, when the ancient citadel of Judaism—the Temple—collapsed, the Jewish people were not left without a haven of spiritual refuge. The vineyard of Jabneh,* planted by the hands of Rabban Jochanan ben Zakkai, was quickly to take its place, as the source of religious sustenance for the stricken people. Only a building, however sacred its associations, had been destroyed; the Holy Spirit found an abode in the School. The Talmud narrates the story of the martyrdom of Rabbi Channina ben Teradyon, how his body was wrapped in a Scroll of the Law and slowly burnt. When his disciples asked him what he saw, the Rabbi replied: "I see the parchment leaves of the Scroll burning, but its letters flying away."† Similarly may it be said of the Jewish nation: when the sight of the Temple in flames horrified their eyes and pierced their hearts, the keener-visioned of them saw its sanctifying spirit fly from the doomed structure to live on in the Beth Hamidrash‡ and revivify the Jewish people.

* The school of learning established at Jabneh in Southern Palestine is usually referred to as a vineyard in Rabbinic literature.

†*Abodah Zarah* 18 a.

‡ "House of the Study,"—the Hebrew name for a school of religious learning.

In still another way did the Pharisees prepare the nation for the downfall of the Temple and help them to survive. They had much to do in making the Synagogue the spiritual home of the people. Again it must be clearly understood that the Synagogue was not a new institution which came into existence within the period we are considering. Indeed, writers of the first century, like Philo and Josephus, regarded it as so ancient that they placed its origin in the days of Moses. In all probability, the Synagogue—*i.e.*, a meeting-place for Jewish religious intercourse—first made its appearance in Babylon during the captivity, and—significantly—was intended as a substitute for the ruined Temple whereby the religious and national consciousness of the exiles might be kept alive. Although the Synagogue maintained a continuous existence from that time onwards, it would seem that when the Second Temple was erected, the necessity for this additional Jewish centre was not so much felt—at any rate in Judea. We have little historical data to work upon when dealing with the obscure period of the fourth and third centuries. We know, however, that the communities out-

side the Holy Land, *e.g.*, Egypt, felt the need of, and continued to maintain, Synagogues as a rallying point for their members. In Judea, on the other hand, the Temple had been restored; three times a year every adult Jew made his pilgrimage to Jerusalem. He was thus linked on to the body of his people; and no urgent need was experienced for the Synagogue. In this manner, I think, we have to explain the remarkable silence of the Books of the Maccabees with regard to this institution. We are given a detailed account of the measures which Antiochus adopted for the purpose of suppressing the Jewish religion; but nothing is mentioned about Synagogues. It is always precarious to argue from silence; still, it seems to me justifiable to deduce from the fact that we have no mention of the Synagogue in a connection where we should certainly expect it, that Synagogues did not then exist in Judea, or were few in number and played no part of importance in the life of the people.

When, however, we come to the period under review, the Synagogue had established itself throughout Judea. All the evidence we have, in Rabbinic literature, Josephus and the New

Testament, points in one direction, that the Synagogue had grown into one of the most important of communal institutions. There was even a Synagogue within the Temple-precincts.* To what, then, have we to attribute the growth of the Synagogue in the Holy Land? It must have been due to the activities of the Pharisees, because it must be remembered that the Synagogue was not primarily a House of Prayer. It was the place where the people resorted for the purpose of reading the Torah and hearing its exposition—an essentially Pharisaic proceeding. The Babylonian Talmud declares that at the time of the destruction of the Temple, there were 394 Synagogues in Jerusalem; and a passage in the Palestinian Talmud puts the number at 480. We need not accept either as accurate; but in the capital and the other towns, there must have been large numbers of them. The holding of regular services was the normal practice, and the Jew had learnt to go to the Synagogue for spiritual communion and religious instruction and guidance. Through these means also, the people were not left naked when the Temple fell. They had their ark of

* *Cf.* Kraus's *Synagogale Altertümer*, and the *Jewish Encyl.* xi, 619 ff.

refuge in which they could shelter from the storm that beat about them. Within its walls they found consolation in the national calamity which had befallen them; and they listened there to teachers whose words revived their spirits and turned their eyes away from the horrors of the present to the visions of the Messianic hope. Though the national body had been battered and mutilated beyond recovery, the individual Jew acquired in the Synagogue the will to live.

We have thus far dealt with the influence of Pharisaism in the preservation of the Jewish people. But when we study the history of the period, we may detect another important factor at work, *viz.* a divorce between Judaism and Judea. You are probably aware that in its early stage, organised religion was tribal or national, and also local. Each race had its god; and likewise each god was believed to be attached to a certain piece of territory. Thus in Numbers xxi. 29 the Moabites are called "the people of Chemosh," exactly as Israel is called "the people of the Lord." As for the connection between a locality and a god, we have an illuminating narrative in the 17th chapter of the Second Book of Kings. After the king of

Assyria had defeated the kingdom of Israel and carried the people into captivity, he repopulated the land with men and women from various places. These settlers were troubled by lions, which had probably increased in numbers owing to the desolation consequent upon war. This simple explanation did not occur to the settlers or did not satisfy them. To their minds, there was an obvious reason for this trouble which had come upon them—they did not know how to worship the God of that district. They accordingly sent a deputation to the Assyrian King with this message: "The nations which thou hast carried away, and placed in the cities of Samaria, know not the manner of the God of the land; therefore He hath sent lions among them, and, behold, they slay them, because they know not the manner of the God of the land." What did the king do? He arranged for a captive Israelite priest to be sent back to his native country and teach the new inhabitants the religious practices of the former inhabitants. This is the origin of the people known as the Samaritans. There was a similar thought in the minds of the Israelite captives in Babylon

who exclaimed sorrowfully, "How shall we sing the Lord's song in a foreign land?"* And when Jonah declined to accept the divine commission, he hoped to escape punishment for his refusal by fleeing to Tarshish "from the presence of the Lord."†

If these thoughts had prevailed in Israel in the first century, they would have been fatal to the continuance of Jewry after the disaster. Had the Jews then believed that God was exclusively theirs, the fall of His Temple and the banishment of His people could only have been interpreted as the hopeless defeat of the Israelite God by the Roman deities, and all faith in Him would have disappeared. Likewise, if the idea had persisted that God could only be truly worshipped in the Holy Land, it is obvious what would have happened when the Jews were driven from their country—they would have abandoned that worship. From this point of view, it is most striking to note how remarkable a break from these old ideas is to be detected in Jewish life in the early part of the first century. In contradiction to the thought of a tribal god, we have an extra-

* *Psalms*, cxxxvii. 4. † *Jonah*, i. 3.

ordinary manifestation of its very opposite, *viz.* a strong missionary movement to convert gentiles and bring them into the Jewish fold. And in contradistinction to the localisation of the worship of God, we find a noteworthy emigration on the part of Jews from Judea and the founding of Jewish communities outside the boundaries of the Holy Land. To both of these movements attention must be briefly directed.

There was a Jewish Diaspora long before the overthrow of the Jewish State. In the year 70 C.E., there were probably as many Jews residing outside Judea as within its boundaries. Philo informs us that there were one million Jews living in Egypt in the early part of the first century. In his treatise "Against Flaccus" (§8), he writes: "No one country can contain the whole Jewish nation, by reason of its populousness, on which account they frequent all the most prosperous and fertile countries of Europe and Asia, whether islands or continents, looking indeed upon the Holy City as their metropolis in which is erected the sacred temple of the Most High God, but accounting those regions which have been occu-

pied by their fathers and grandfathers, and still more remote ancestors, in which they have been born and brought up, as their country." Josephus (Ant. xiv. 7.2) quotes a passage from Strabo of Cappadocia (a heathen author whose work is otherwise lost) in which it is stated: "These Jews are already gotten into all cities; it is hard to find a place in the habitable earth that hath not admitted this tribe of men, and is not possessed by them." On his own account Josephus declares (B.J. vii. 3.3): "For as the Jewish nation is widely dispersed over all the habitable earth among its inhabitants, so is it very much intermingled with Syria by reason of its neighbourhood, and had the greatest multitudes in Antioch by reason of the largeness of the city." The New Testament likewise provides evidence of the existence of numerous Jewish communities outside the Holy Land, particularly along the Mediterranean seaboard. The second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles mentions Jews residing in Parthia, Media, Elam, Mesopotamia, Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia, Phrygia, Pamphylia, Egypt, Libya, Cyrene, Crete and Arabia. It has been calculated from data provided by Cicero in his

oration on behalf of Flaccus, that there must have been over 180,000 persons of the Jewish Faith resident in Asia Minor.* Two lectures in this course are to be devoted to the important communities of Jews in Alexandria and Babylon.† There was a large and flourishing Jewish colony in Rome. We are informed that when envoys came from Judea to petition Augustus for the deposition of Archelaus, over 8,000 Roman Jews joined them.‡ The Jewish population must obviously have greatly exceeded that number. There is a mass of other evidence, which I need not detail here, demonstrating beyond doubt the wide dispersion of the Jewish people while the State was still in existence. What I have mentioned is sufficient to prove that when the deadly blow fell, it directly affected only a part of the Jewish people. The shock of the fallen Temple reverberated wherever Jews dwelt. The uprooting of the nation from its home was felt and deeply lamented by members of the Jewish race wherever they resided. But through their long residence in foreign lands, they had been taught

* *Cf. Jewish Encycl.* Art. "Diaspora" iv, 559 ff.
† The lecture on Alexandrian Jews was not delivered.
‡ *Antiquities*, xvii, 11, 1.

how to live, *qua* Jews, away from the national homeland and apart from the Sanctuary. Their grief, when the disaster came, was a sentimental feeling of loss; but it was not a feeling of hopelessness and despair. They escaped the dangerous thought that the end had come, and there was nothing for the Jew, as Jew, to live for. The spiritual bonds which connected Jews wherever they dwelt and however scattered, were considerably strengthened when the Temple ceased to exist; and the essential unity of the race was secured through the means of a common study of the Torah, a common worship in the Synagogue, and a common hope in the future.

The existence of a strong missionary movement among Jews during our period is corroborated by non-Jewish as well as Jewish writers. In his treatise on "The Life of Moses," Philo writes: "[The laws of Moses] lead after them and influence all nations, barbarians and Greeks, the inhabitants of continents and islands, the eastern nations and the western, Europe and Asia; in short, the whole habitable world from one extremity to the other."* In particular were women converted

* Yonge's trans., ii. 137.

to Judaism, probably from a feeling of revolt against the immoral tendencies of Greek mythology. Among the most noted converts of this period was the royal family of Adiabene, a small country on the banks of the Tigris, and we read in the Mishna* of the costly presents which this family sent to the Temple. Josephus informs us that nearly all the women in Damascus followed the Jewish religion.† In several passages he mentions the active missionary propaganda of the Jews and its effects. In his reply to Apio, a hostile critic of the Jewish people, he says: "The multitudes of mankind itself have had a great inclination of a long time to follow our religious observances, for there is not any city of the Grecians, nor any of the barbarians, nor any nation whatsoever, whither our custom of resting on the seventh day hath not come and by which our fasts and lighting up lamps and many of our prohibitions as to our food are not observed."‡ In his book on "The Jewish Wars" he declares: "The Jews also made proselytes of a great many of the Greeks perpetually, and thereby, after a sort, brought them to be a

* *Joma* iii. 10. † *Wars* ii. 20. 2. ‡ ii. 40.

portion of their own body."* So numerous were such conversions in his time, that he says with confidence in *Contra Apionem*: "If anyone will but reflect on his own country, and his own family, he will have reason to give credit to what I say."† Josephus would not have ventured to make so sweeping a statement unless it was a very well-known fact that conversions to Judaism were extremely prevalent.

Especially in Rome large numbers of converts were made. Horace and Juvenal satirise this Judaising tendency among their countrymen. Tacitus, in the fifth Book of his History, writes: "The most degraded out of other races, scorning their national beliefs, brought to them [*i.e.* to the Jews] their contributions and presents." Tacitus has here sacrificed historical accuracy for the antipathy which he felt against the Jews. These proselytes were far from being "the most degraded"; some of them were drawn from the Imperial house. Graetz has written a valuable essay on Roman converts to Judaism.‡

The religious leaders of Jewry were not agreed on the advisability of making proselytes.

* vii. 3. 3. † *loc. cit.*
‡ *Die jüdischen Proselyten im Römerreiche.*

The well-known story of the heathen who came to Shammai and then to Hillel for the purpose of learning the whole of Judaism while he stood on one foot illustrates this divergence of opinion. But I doubt whether any Rabbi disapproved of the *principle* of conversion. It had its disadvantages as well as advantages. Shining lights in Israel, like Abtalion, Akiba and Meir, were descended from converts; but so were Antipater and Herod. It is also probable that Roman spies pretended to become followers of the Jewish religion in order to have greater facilities for carrying on their work. And lastly, the numbers in which these converts forsook Judaism for Christianity—and indeed helped to establish this new Faith—made many Rabbis question the sincerity of proselytes generally. However this may be, it cannot be doubted that the universal idea in Judaism came strongly to the fore at the beginning of our period. This means that the ethical and spiritual aspect of the Faith was stressed and appreciated. Judaism was understood to be something greater than a system of sacrifices and a Temple-cult. Therefore when the Sanctuary ceased to function,

only one phase of the Jewish religion ceased with it. Its great moral and spiritual teachings were unaffected—nay, were enhanced in the popular estimation by the burning of the Temple. It is related that once Rabban Jochanan ben Zakkai and R. Joshua were gazing upon the ruins of the Temple, when the latter exclaimed, "Woe to us that this place, where Israel obtained pardon for sins, is destroyed!" But Rabban Jochanan comforted him with these words: "Do not despair; we still have a means of atonement equally efficacious, *viz.*, *Gemilut Hasadim*, beneficent acts." (Ab. d'R. Nathan iv). The eternal and indestructible elements in the Jewish Faith were raised into prominence when the sacrifices were no longer brought: and so far from Judaism perishing in the flames of the doomed Temple, it took on a fresh lease of life.

I have now completed the main task undertaken in this Introductory Lecture, *viz.* to trace the causes which resulted in the destruction of Temple and State, and the factors that prevented this event from having the fatal consequence to the Jewish people and to Judaism which it might well have been

expected to have. Were I, however, to bring my lecture to a close at this point, I should be omitting a theme of the greatest importance in the history of the world which is inevitably called to mind by the mention of the first century. I refer to the rise of Christianity. This is too big a subject to be attached to the end of an address; and it is to be regretted that a whole lecture is not to be devoted to it in this course. All I can now hope to do is to touch very briefly on the fringe of the subject in one of its Jewish aspects.

The question which now calls for discussion is, what was thought of this new creed by the Jews in the Holy Land in the first century? The place where we should naturally first turn for the answer is the pages of Josephus; but we meet with a disappointment. We do indeed find a passage in the 18th Book of Antiquities where Jesus is described; but it is now generally agreed that, at any rate in its present form, it is the work of a later Christian copyist. On the question whether Josephus actually wrote about the founder of Christianity there is still a sharp conflict of opinion. A considerable number of scholars hold that the passage is spurious from

beginning to end. If this be so, the silence of the historian must be explained in one of two ways. Either it was contemptuous and Josephus regarded the movement as too insignificant to mention; or there existed a deep hostility against the new creed among the faithful Jews, and he deemed it prudent not to write about it. Both hypotheses are open to grave objections. Against the first theory we have to set two passages* which record the murder of John the Baptist and the stoning of James, the brother of Jesus, which do not read like interpolations. Then again, Josephus thought it worth while to include the story of the pseudo-Messiah, Theudas, who "persuaded a great part of the people to take their effects with them, and follow him to the river Jordan; for he told them he was a prophet, and that he would, by his own command, divide the river, and afford an easy passage over it; and many were deluded by his words."† The Roman procurator sent cavalry to intercept the party, many of whom were put to death, Theudas among them. Josephus also preserves a record of another impostor, whose name he does not give—but he

* *Antiquities* xviii. 5. 2; xx. 9. 1. † *Antiquities* xx. 5. 1.

has been plausibly identified with Ben Satda mentioned in the Talmud—who came to Jerusalem from Egypt, saying "he was a prophet, and advised the multitude of the common people to go along with him to the Mount of Olives. . . . He said further that he would show them from thence how, at his command, the walls of Jerusalem would fall down."* Again the procurator intervened and had a number of the deluded people slain. The leader escaped, but was no more heard of. Now if Josephus took the trouble to include these insignificant incidents which led to nothing, is it reasonable to suppose that he would have ignored a religious movement which persisted throughout his life? As for the second theory, that of prudential silence on account of hostility, there is no evidence to support it.

It is therefore more probable that the existing reference to Jesus was re-written by a later copyist; and the original wording has been reconstructed by Theodore Reinach† as follows: "There was about that time a certain Jesus, a wise man; for he was a worker of miracles, a teacher of men eager to receive new tidings, and

* *ibid.* 8. 6. † *Revue des Etudes juives*, xxxv. 1–18.

he drew over to him many Jews and also many of the Hellenic world. He was proclaimed Christ; and when, on denunciation by the principal men amongst us, Pilate condemned him to be crucified, those that were first captivated by him did not cease to adhere to him; and the tribe of Christians is not extinct at this day."

This description of Jesus as a "wise man and worker of miracles" is to some extent confirmed by the allusions to him in the early uncensored editions, and manuscript copies, of the Talmud. These Rabbinic passages have often been collected and examined. For the English reader, the best work on the subject is Herford's "Christianity in Talmud and Midrash." For the reader of modern Hebrew, the most recent discussion is that in Klausner's *Jeshu ha-Notsri*. The Talmudic references raise numerous and difficult problems; but Klausner's conclusion, after submitting them to close examination is, that whereas some of Jesus' teachings and practices met with disapproval, there is no indication of bitter antagonism against him and his disciples up to the end of the first century.

Another important source of information is,

of course, the books of the New Testament. When these documents, especially the Synoptic Gospels, are read in the light of modern scholarship, what impression do they give of the attitude towards Jesus on the part of his Jewish contemporaries? He never claimed to be the founder of a new religion, nor did his fellow-Jews in Judea think of him in that light. He lived his life within the Community; he paid his dues to the Temple; he prayed in the Synagogues and was even allowed to address the assemblies there. It is true that, according to the Gospels, his teaching created astonishment among his hearers. His doctrines were certainly different from those of the Rabbinic teachers in many important respects; but they were not of such a character as to warrant his expulsion from the Community. From the theological standpoint, the Rabbis, although disagreeing with his opinions, were sufficiently tolerant to recognise Jesus and those who accepted his views as members of the House of Israel. Active opposition was only aroused when he began attacking the Sadducean priesthood and claimed to be, or allowed himself to be hailed as, the Messiah. Then the Romans

suppressed him exactly as they later suppressed Theudas and the Egyptian self-styled " prophet."

For a not inconsiderable period after his death, the sect remained a part of the Jewish body. Its headquarters were in Jerusalem; and its first bishops were Jews who were, in the main, observant of the Torah. The doctrines they preached did not outrage Jewish sentiment. Outwardly they conformed to Jewish religious practice, and what distinguished them from the generality of Jews was their belief in the Messiahship of Jesus. Of the growth of the sect, Renan writes: " The conversions to Christianity became soon much more numerous amongst the ' Hellenists ' than amongst the ' Hebrews.' The old Jews at Jerusalem were but little drawn towards a sect of provincials, moderately advanced in the single science that a Pharisee appreciated—the science of the Law . . . . That which grew out of official Judaism was the Talmud; but Christianity has no affinity with the Talmudic school. This is why Christianity found special favour amongst the parties, the least Jewish belonging to Judaism. The rigid orthodoxists took to it but little; it

was the new-comers, people scarcely catechised, who had not been to any of the great schools, free from routine, and not initiated into the holy tongue, which lent an ear to the apostles and the disciples.''*

It is thus evident that in the early years of the movement, there were two discordant elements within the sect which were bound to clash. The disciples of Jesus, those who had been closely associated with him and had heard his teachings, remembered his emphatic declaration, " Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.''† On the other hand, the " Hellenists '' and newly-made Jewish proselytes who joined the sect were possessed by no such feeling of reverence for

* *Apostles*, p. 60. † *Matthew*, v. 17 ff.

the Law; and their open breach with Jewish rite and custom brought down upon them not only the disapproval of the older brethren, but sterner action by the Pharisees. Where we read in the first century of hostility against the sect, it is caused not by the belief in Jesus as the Messiah—although that, of course, was rejected —but by the public desecration on the part of some of their members of Jewish religious law.

This antinomian party—the party antagonistic to the Law—acquired new importance and eventually controlling influence, when it was joined by the domineering personality of a Jew named Saul, better known as Paul of Tarsus. He has been described as "the second founder of Christianity." A more accurate description historically would be "the first founder of Christianity," because his activities not only brought about a definite cleavage between the believers in Jesus and the mass of Jewry, but he created the theological system upon which the Christian Church was erected. It is difficult to trace much resemblance between the teachings of Jesus as we read them in the Gospels, and the exposition of Christian doctrine given by Paul in his Epistles. The wide divergence

between them may be illustrated by one fact only. When Jesus preached in the Synagogues, his hearers were, as I said, astonished.* When Paul preached in the Synagogues, his words sounded so blasphemous to Jewish ears that there were riots.†

Even the original disciples like Peter and Jesus' brother, James, were shocked by Paul's fierce opposition to the Torah, and a heated controversy ensued. A compromise was eventually reached, *viz.* that the older school, which adhered to the Law, should confine its activities to Judea; whereas Paul should be free to preach his doctrines to the gentile world. He set out on his famous missionary journeys, and was successful in establishing Churches in Asia Minor, Greece, Rome and elsewhere, his first adherents being usually the Jewish converts who found the yoke of the new creed less burdensome, and more in harmony with the ideas which prevailed among their neighbours, than the yoke of the Torah. In this manner there arose the Christian Church as distinct from the Synagogue. The downfall of the Temple must have sent over to the Church some of the

* *Mark* i. 22 ; vi. 2. † *Acts* xiii. 50 ; xiv. 1 ff. ; xvii. 5.

weaker members of the Jewish Community, particularly proselytes, whose faith was shaken. Thus the division between the Jewish brotherhood and the Christian sect became decisive and unmistakable, the gulf being widened as the Church flourished and established itself firmly.

With this hastily-drawn outline of the rise of Christianity I must be content. Time does not permit of greater detail. Nor have I the time to dwell upon the lessons that Jewish history in the first century has to teach the present generation of Jewry. Suffice it to state that one cannot study this period of crisis without being impressed with a sense of the greatness of Judaism which came safely through so searching a time of test. A religion must surely possess elements of eternity which could survive the shattering storms of that age of upheaval. It is in the first century that we find striking confirmation of the prophetic assurance: "The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God standeth for ever."

LECTURE II

THE APOCALYPSES: THEIR PLACE IN JEWISH HISTORY

BY

F. C. BURKITT, F.B.A., D.D.,
Norrisian Professor of Divinity, University of Cambridge

THE APOCALYPSES:

THEIR PLACE IN JEWISH HISTORY

The Jewish Apocalypses about which I am to speak to you to-day are the "Book of Daniel," the "Book of Enoch," the "Testaments of the XII Patriarchs," the "Assumption of Moses," the "Apocalypse of Baruch" and the "Second Book of Esdras." The first and the last of these are familiar names; the rest are less known, outside the narrow circle of scholars who interest themselves in this literature. And therefore it will be my first business to explain in what the importance of this literature consists, and why it is of some interest to us even to-day.

This can be stated in a very few words. The Jewish Apocalypses themselves and the state of mind that produced them had a great and formative influence on the minds of the earliest Christians; I venture to think we can go so far as to say that without some knowledge of the

Jewish Apocalypses and a fairly clear realisation of the state of mind in which they were composed, it is impossible to understand the earliest Christianity, impossible to enter at all into the hopes and fears of the "multitudes," of the crowd, that forms the background of the Gospels. This in itself is a sufficient justification for careful study, for, whatever may be our personal attitude towards the Christian Religion in general, it has played and still plays so great a part in human affairs, that anything which elucidates its development is of interest. And certainly no one has much right to criticise it, far less reject its claims, without making an effort to understand it.

But further, these Apocalypses are interesting as the most characteristic monuments of the great struggle between Judaism and Hellenism, a struggle which we can call without manifest unfairness that between Religion and Civilisation. Both these are great and honourable names to us, but I need only give what is practically the German equivalent for the latter term and say "Religion *versus* 'Kultur'" to show you that an intelligent organisation of the material goods of this life may take on the aspect of

a frightful ogre. What, then, was this struggle between Judaism and Hellenism? Is its true modern equivalent "Religion *versus* 'Kultur,'" or "Superstition *versus* Civilisation"? For indeed no thoughtful man will deny the debt of the modern world to ancient Greece. It is not for nothing that the modern scientist who discovers a new gas or a new disease straightway proceeds to give it a more or less Greek name, for it is to the Greeks that we owe the beginnings of our science, our philosophy, our habits of exact thought.

Let me, then, as shortly as I can, set out the quarrel between Jew and Greek, that blazed out in an episode of fierce rebellion and bloodshed between the years 168-165 B.C.E., but as a contest between two views of life endured for centuries and indeed is still a factor in human affairs.

It is difficult, when the historical investigator begins to set down what we inherit from the ancient Greeks, to avoid the language of extravagance. *Philosophy* and *Democracy* are alike Greek words, and the ideas which they represent to us were first developed by the Greeks. They were the first race of men who

said "Why?" to what their elders told them. "Prove, try, test all things, hold fast to that which is good"*—that is a sentence familiar to us from our Bibles, and it was penned by one who was a Jew by birth, but it shows how strongly the Greek spirit had influenced Saint Paul. One of the ideas most characteristic of early Christian thought is the doctrine of the *Logos*. "In the beginning was the Logos," says the Fourth Gospel; this is practically untranslatable out of Greek, for the Greeks had one expression for Word and Reason and Ordered Plan—to them *Logos* meant all three. The rule of *reason*, as opposed to mere tradition, of *rational plan* as opposed to haphazard, and, in addition, of *due proportion* as opposed to excess,—these were leading Greek ideals, first of all in politics, in civic life, and then by a natural development in their philosophical thought and in their ideas about the Universe. How modern this enthronement of reason and proportion sounds to us! Yes, but it is not characteristic of the non-Greek world; it is not characteristic of the Old Testament. It is not, I may add, specially characteristic of the old

* I. Thess. v., 21.

Egyptian or Babylonian literature. The Romans had it; but they, like ourselves, have been to school in Greece.

The result of the career and conquests of Alexander the Great was that this Hellenism, that is, this new stock of ideas which the Greeks had brought into being, became politically dominant over all the lands with which the Old Testament is concerned. The Empire of Alexander the Great was practically made up of the Turkey in Europe and the Turkey in Asia of the maps of our boyhood, together with Egypt and Persia. Alexander reigned and conquered from 336-323 B.C.E., and after his death his political inheritance was fought for by his chief captains, the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. Into their wars we need not go very deeply; the important thing is that whether the overlord of Palestine was a Greek who lived at Alexandria in Egypt, or a Greek who lived at Antioch in Syria, in either case it was a Greek, and the intellectual influence of the Greek way of looking at things was working from the time of Alexander the Great onwards with a vigour and a solvent force exactly comparable to what we call the influence

of "science" during the last seventy years.

Ancient Religion was almost entirely a national affair. It was not so much that the official religion was "established" by the State as that the Church and State were each of them departments of national life. No doubt there were certain customs and taboos that private persons had to observe: you must not eat this or that animal, or this and that part of the animals which you did eat; similarly the traditional customs of a tribe or nation concerned with birth, marriage, and burial, all had the sanction of religion. But in the main the God or Gods whom men worshipped were pre-eminently the Gods of the nation or city to which they belonged. The God was their leader and defender in war; His honour was the nation's honour, and the nation's calamity was His disgrace. Now in the 400 years before Alexander dozens of the little states of Western Asia had lost their independence. They had been swallowed up by the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Persians. Then there came the Greeks. What happened to the Gods of these little States? What had happened to

Chemosh, God of the Moabites?—to name but one familiar instance.

Speaking generally, one of three things happened. In some cases the worship of the God ceased with the cessation of the national life. Chemosh and Asshur, for example, do not seem to have survived the independent existence of the Moabite and Assyrian States. In other cases the cult lingered on, but the God of the conquered and enslaved nation was no longer supreme, and in some cases sank to the rôle of a local Demon. Sometimes, again, local worship persisted, but it became to some extent the worship of the God of the conquerors: it was discovered that the old God was a local manifestation of a world-wide Deity. The Syrian devotees who had always called their God "the Lord of Heaven"—*Baal Shmin* is found in more than one place—were willing enough to agree with Greeks who considered that this was what they called Zeus, the God of the open Sky, always above a man wherever he goes. Astarte and other nature Goddesses were identified with Aphrodite or Artemis. When therefore Antiochus Epiphanes, one of the successors of Alexander, about the year 170 B.C.E., wanted to

rename the Temple in Jerusalem as a Temple of Zeus Olympius, and that of the Samaritans that of Zeus Xenius,* he doubtless thought he was conferring a privilege.

But the development of religious thought had run among the Jews, who lived at Jerusalem and in the villages round about, a course directly counter to that of the populations round them. A large majority of the Jews would have nothing to do with the syncretism of Antiochus Epiphanes; they refused either to give up the worship of their national God or to identify Him with any of the Gods of the heathen. And when the Greek overlord persisted, and the Jews were left with the alternative of what they regarded as apostasy or of being executed as rebels, great numbers of them preferred to die: "be it known unto thee, O King, that we will not serve thy Gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up."†

I use these familiar words of the Book of Daniel, because the book was written at that very time to encourage the faithful in their trial. But before looking closer at this

* II. Macc. vi., 1. † Dan. iii., 18.

famous work, let us briefly glance at some of the general characteristics of the Jewish literature which belongs to this period, to see how some of its features are the direct result of the peculiar circumstances of the Jewish nation.

The religion of the Jews was not merely a set of national customs. Whatever it had been in the old days, before the Captivity, it was now a belief that their national customs had been given them at a definite date in past history by their God, who was the only true God. Their God had made a Covenant, a treaty, with them, and this treaty, which contained the Law which God had given them to keep, was actually enshrined in a Book, the five books which we call the Pentateuch. Ever since the time of Nehemiah, two centuries and a half before the time of which we are speaking, the Pentateuch, just as we read it now, had been accepted by the Jews as containing the authoritative revealed Will of God. In the old days, indeed, besides the revelation to Moses it was believed that God had also spoken to others, to His Prophets. There had been Prophets who stood beside Zerubbabel when he restored worship in the Temple at the end of the Captivity, but the race

had died out. There were no more Prophets. Scribes had taken their places, the men who collected together the writings of the old Prophets, but did not dare themselves to say "Thus saith the Lord." It was felt that Divine revelation was finished, it had already been given. And so, throughout the whole period we are considering, the Jew who felt that he had a message to his people does not come forward in his own name, but shelters himself under some great personage of old time. If anything was really true, they felt, it must have been revealed to some great man of the heroic age. The Book of Daniel is no isolated phenomenon. Ezra, Baruch the secretary of Jeremiah, Solomon, Moses, the Twelve Patriarchs, Abraham, Noah, Enoch, even Adam himself, all have writings fathered upon them, which were really written by Jews who lived in the two centuries before the Christian era.

I do not propose to touch more than is necessary on the Book of Daniel, though it is one of the most influential books that ever was written. We see in it quite fully developed the two great characteristics of the Jewish Apocalypses. One is the passionate expecta-

tion of the End, which brings with it the final judgment of God that will set all wrongs right· and the other is an attempt to construct a philosophy of history.

A *philosophy of history*, from the Jewish point of view! It might seem an impossible task, and of course what the Apocalyptists give us is not expressed in these words, both, we may remark, of Greek derivation. But the task was really laid upon them. It will not be necessary for us to follow the course of the external struggle between the Jews and the Seleucid Monarchy. Very early in the conflict the Jews were granted full liberty to retain their national worship and ancestral customs. The Temple was re-dedicated in December 165, only three years after the " abomination of desolation " had been set up by Antiochus; the war went on, but it became a mere worldly fight for political power, which ended, owing to the disintegration of the central power, in the complete independence of the Jewish State. In B.C.E. 143 was the yoke of the heathen taken away from Israel* under Simon, brother of Judas Macca-

* I. Macc. xiii., 41.

bæus, and under Simon's son and grandsons the Jewish territory was practically extensive with the Kingdom of David. From 63 B.C.E. onwards they became subject to the Romans, partly under vassal kings, partly under direct administration. Then, after about a century and a quarter of foreign dominion the Jews rebelled, but the Roman Empire was a very different thing from that of the Seleucids. In four years all was over. Jerusalem was taken by Titus in 70 C.E., and the Jewish State and the Jewish Temple passed away.

But besides these visible wars, there was another. As I have already phrased it, it was for the Jews a struggle between Religion and Civilisation. If the Jewish Religion was to prove itself a worthy adversary of the Greek view of life it must be able to give an intelligible account of the world. This is what the Apocalypses attempt to do.

If we are to take one phrase as a motto for the Greek view of life, it would be perhaps the Delphic counsel "Know thyself," or we might take the dictum of Aristotle "All mankind naturally desire knowledge." The most characteristic Jewish motto would be "Shall not

the Judge of all the earth do right?"* This emotional faith in eventual Justice, the conviction that however bad things seem now they will eventually—nay, very soon—be put right for ever, is the dominating and constructive principle of the Jewish Apocalypses.

After the Book of Daniel the most important of these works is what is known as the Book of Enoch. This is a sort of encyclopædia or "Treasury of Knowledge." It treats of the origin of evil, of physical geography, of the place of the Dead, of the coming judgment upon the wicked, of the names of the Angels, of astronomy, of universal history, and concludes with woes pronounced upon the ungodly and encouragements for the righteous. It is all put into the mouth of Enoch, the seventh from Adam, except where Noah, Enoch's grandson, seems to be represented as the compiler.

Let me quote some passages, before we go on to consider what the interest of this queer farrago is for us. Here is the beginning:—

> "The word of the blessing of Enoch, how he blessed elect righteous men who will be in

* Gen. xviii., 25.

the day of distress when all the adversaries will be rooted out and the righteous will be saved. And he took up his parable and said:

"Enoch, a righteous man is he, a vision from God was opened for him, the vision of the Holy One and of heaven He shewed me. . . . and as I heard all things I myself knew them as I looked. And not for this present generation did I consider, but for one far distant do I speak, and concerning the elect I now say it and for them have I taken up my parable. The Holy One, the Great, will come forth from His habitation, and the God of eternity will tread on the earth on Mount Sinai. . . . and all will fear and the Evil Angels will quake. . . . the high mountains will fall and the high hills be laid low. . . . and all things that are on the earth will be destroyed. And there will be a judgment on all things and with the righteous He will make peace, and on the elect will be protection. . . . and light will shine for them and He will make peace upon them. For He comes with His ten thousands and His holy ones to do judgment upon all, and will destroy all the ungodly and will convict

> all flesh for all the works of ungodliness which they have ungodly done, and all the stubborn words they have spoken, and for all the things that ungodly sinners have uttered against Him."

Some of you may notice that this passage is actually quoted in the New Testament, in the Epistle of Jude (iv. 14-15).

Enoch goes on to point out that the Sun and Moon and the Seasons all obey their orders and come at their appointed times, the trees become green year after year, but the wicked have changed the course appointed for them, and transgressed the commandments. So for them there will be no peace, but

> " for the elect there will be light and joy and peace, and they will inherit the Earth. . . the number of the days of their life they will fulfil, and their life will be lengthened in peace, and the years of their joy will be multiplied in gladness and peace eternal in all the days of their life."

This is the Prologue to the work. I have somewhat curtailed it, but you will see something of the style, the continual repetitions, the

religious outlook upon everything, the frank animism that sees in Sun and Moon, Winter and Summer, heavenly beings with a certain amount of freedom and will, who perform their periodic tasks not mechanically, but in obedience to Divine Commands; and, above all, you see the insistence upon the great Reckoning which the writer believes will take place at the appointed time.

After the Prologue comes the story of the Origin of Evil. It is one of the peculiarities of Enoch that very little emphasis is laid on the story of Adam and Eve in the Garden. That story is referred to in Chapter xxxii., where Enoch in his bird's-eye view of the world is shown Paradise and the Tree of Understanding, but from what is said there the only result of the eating of the fruit is that Adam and Eve were driven out; it does not figure as the cause of human misery and viciousness. According to Enoch the cause is to be found in the disobedience of the Watchers, *i.e.*, the "Sons of God" spoken of in Genesis vi., who left their post and came down to earth and married the daughters of men. This mythical event in the system of Enoch corresponds in its fatal effect

to the disobedience of Adam in St. Paul's system. And it had the further advantage, that it explained what was to the ancient world as patent and terrible a fact as the existence of moral evil, *viz.* the nature of demons. For the progeny of the Sons of God and the daughters of men were monstrous giants " who consumed all the labour of men and when men could supply them no more the giants turned against them and devoured mankind" (vii., 3-4). The wicked Sons of God moreover taught men all sorts of unlawful arts, magic and astrology (ix., 9.), so that the whole earth was filled with blood and unrighteousness. A dreadful punishment followed, corresponding to the Flood in Genesis; not only are all mankind destroyed by the Deluge except Enoch's grandson Noah and his family, but the wicked Sons of God, Semiaza and Azazel and their nineteen companions, the cause of all the mischief, are bound hand and foot and cast into darkness, to await the final punishment of the judgment, while their monstrous brood, after killing one another, remain as evil spirits on the earth. " The spirits of the giants, Nephilim, oppress, destroy, attack, hurtle, dash men

down upon the earth, fierce spirits of giants, wandering about; and they will rise up against the sons of men and women, because they came out from them.''*

Whatever views we take of the stories of demoniac possession in the Gospels and in other writings of the period, there can be little doubt that the Galilean crowds took a view essentially that of Enoch. The air was believed to be full of half-human invisible beings, whose greatest delight was to enter into a man and rob him of his self-possession. The strange tale told in the Book of Enoch seemed to account for the presence of these monsters.

After telling of the origin of evil, Enoch is taken by good Angels round the world, from East to West and from North to South. It is but little that he knows—in our sense of the word "knowledge." His leading idea is that all Creation, the Universe, must have been originally perfect, everything fitting harmoniously, and if things do not fit now it must be the fault of some being, whether man or angel. "Be-

* Enoch xv., 11, 12.

yond the deep abyss,"* says he, "I saw a place which had no firmament of heaven above nor firmly founded earth beneath, there was no water below, no birds flying, but it was a place waste and terrible. There I saw seven stars like great mountains burning, about which when I inquired the angel said 'This place is the end of heaven and earth; this has become a prison for the stars and the host of heaven. And the stars rolling in the fire are they which have transgressed the commandments of the Lord at the beginning of their rising, because they did not come forth at their appointed times; and He was wroth with them, and bound them till the completion of their guilt, a myriad years.'" It seems to have been a puzzle to Enoch that the periods of the Sun and the Moon do not fit. His solution is that the solar year was intended to be 364 days†, i.e. exactly 52 weeks, and the lunar year 354 days: he knows it does not fit the wicked days of the Seleucids and the Maccabees; such a year would be too short for the agricultural facts, the harvest would come too late. "In the days of the sinners," the author makes Enoch prophesy, "the fruits

* Enoch xviii., 12-16. † Enoch lxxii., 32; lxxxii., 6.

of the earth shall be backward and shall not grow in their time, and the moon shall alter her order. . . . and many chiefs of the stars shall transgress their order, and shall alter their orbits and tasks, and not appear at the seasons prescribed for them."*

Alas, alas! it is not by shutting our eyes to the facts, and insisting that the world ought to have been made in such-and-such a way, that we can really grasp the Scheme of Things, far less

" Re-mould it nearer to the Heart's Desire."

The fatal weakness of Jewish Apocalyptic thought is just this, that it was in so great a hurry to emphasise the justice of God that it refused to accept unwelcome facts. It was the same spirit that led the Jewish people in the time of Vespasian to rise in a hopeless struggle against the Roman Empire, and so to be crushed out of existence as a state. At the same time it is just this idealising faculty, this power of determining that God's cause is just and will be victorious, that has kept the Jewish nation still in existence and that gave the Christians,

* Enoch lxxx., 1, 3 ff.

that wonderful movement which sprang out of Judaism, the power to survive and take root, and ultimately to absorb the Roman civilisation itself.

To come back to Enoch. Among the wonderful sights which he sees in the fairyland that our author shews us as the universe is the abode prepared for the Dead. These are four deep Valleys in the West; three of them are dark and only one is bright. When Enoch sees them they are all empty, for we must suppose that of all the human race only Abel as yet is dead; but the angels tell him for what purpose the Valleys have been prepared. The bright Valley is for the spirits of the righteous; of the others, one is for the wicked, one for the unhappy victims of violent death, and the fourth is apparently for the mediocre. In these Valleys the spirits of dead men will await the judgment, the good to be rewarded and the bad punished, while the mediocre are to be left where they are: "Their spirits shall not be punished in the Day of Judgment, nor shall they be raised from thence."* They are not good or bad enough for Heaven or for Hell.

* Enoch xxii., 13.

The part of the Book of Enoch which has attracted most attention in recent days is what are called the Similitudes or Parables, i.e. Chapters xxxvii.-lxxi., according to the modern numbering. This section may be described as a sort of expansion or interpretation of Daniel's picture of the Ancient of Days and the Son of Man.* In Daniel the figure of the Son of Man is expressly explained as standing for "the people of the Saints of the Most High,"† but in Enoch the Son of Man is a personage reserved from the beginning of time‡ to be the actual Judge at the Last Judgment. In one place he is called the "Anointed One" (*i.e.* the Messiah) of the "Lord of Spirits."§ It is obvious that we have here something much nearer to certain Christian ideas and doctrines than anything that can be found in the Old Testament, and we may be sure that Jude, who wrote the Epistle in which our "Enoch" is actually quoted, was not the only Christian of the first generation to whom the book was known and venerable.

After the Similitudes comes the Astronomical

* *See* Dan. vii., 13 ff.
† Dan. vii., 27.
‡ Enoch xlviii., 3.
§ Enoch xlviii., 10.

section about which I have already spoken, and this in turn is followed by Visions of Enoch in which the whole course of History is revealed to him under the form of the fortunes of a flock of animals. The Chosen People are white bulls or sheep, the Ishmaelites are wild asses, the Egyptians wolves, and so on.* It is easy enough to follow the story where it follows the Old Testament, down to the time of the rebuilding of the Temple, the times of Ezra and Nehemiah. Then we come to the Maccabæan revolt—and here the history breaks off and we have a picture of Divine intervention and the Judgment. The inference is obvious; the writer himself is living in the Maccabæan age, before the grandnephews of Judas Maccabæus had degenerated into cruel and altogether worldly tyrants.

"A queer old book!" you will say; "what nonsense it all is!" Yes, a good deal of Enoch *is* nonsense, and it is all rather rambling and confused. Moreover, about those departments of human thought in which it tries to strike out an individual note, the scientific description of the visible universe and the history of the first beginnings of the human race, Enoch and his

* Enoch lxxxv–xc.

fellow-countrymen knew very little. But, after all, the Greeks, their contemporaries, also knew very little, and it has, of course, to be remembered when we judge the pseudo-science of "Enoch" that we have to compare him not with ourselves but with contemporary Greek thinkers, such men for instance as Posidonius. They also, like Enoch, believed in aerial demons and in astrology. No, the main value of Enoch was the mental encouragement he provided for his fellow-countrymen. False or half-false ideas are better than no ideas at all. The Jews who clung to their ancestral customs and their ancestral Law did so in the belief that, after all, human history is not meaningless, that it has a moral purpose, and that the end will

"justify the ways of God to men."

This belief was not shared by the Greeks with whom they came in contact. Greek Philosophy knew nothing of a Day of Judgment, nor did it have any doctrine of Progress or beneficent Evolution. For all the glitter of the late Hellenic civilisation, it meant to the thinker nothing. The human body was a tomb, imprisoning the rational spirit. There was no

goal in the activity of human life, and philosophy consisted in realising this. It is perhaps an act of Faith, rather than a judgment of the Reason, to declare even now that human life has a purpose, but if we ourselves cling to this belief, we ought to have a sympathetic corner in our minds for "Enoch," who taught it so wholeheartedly.

The next work we have to consider is the "Testament of the XII Patriarchs." This professes to give the last dying speeches of Reuben, Simeon, Levi, etc., to their respective sons. The greater part of these speeches consists of eminently respectable moral advice, generally directed against some particular sin or tendency. At the beginning there are fanciful autobiographical details.* Here and there are clear allusions to the coming of Christianity, the most famous being one in which Benjamin alludes to that great Benjamite Paul of Tarsus.† For a long time this curious writing was

* *E.g.* Judah boasts: "I raced a hind and caught it . . . I overtook a wild mare . . . I slew a lion and plucked a kid out of its mouth. I took a bear by its paw and hurled it down the cliff and it was crushed. I outran the wild boar, and seizing it as I ran I tore it asunder" (J. ii. 3 ff); also he took a leopard by the tail and a wild ox by the horns!

† B. xi.

supposed to be entirely the work of a Christian; but as such it was quite incomprehensible, and it is only in the last few years that its real origin and meaning have been discovered.

For it is a Jewish work, originally composed in Hebrew a little before B.C.E. 100; the Christian allusions are interpolations.* Some of these seem to have been made when the work was translated into Greek, others have come in later. The original object of the work was to commend the rule of the Maccabæan Priest-Kings to the Jewish people, both the genuine Jews and also the inhabitants of Galilee and other regions once occupied by the Ten Tribes, and now brought under Jewish rule again by John Hyrcanus (136-107 B.C.E.). Here is a specimen where the reference to the Maccabæan Priest-Kings is clear:† "Draw ye near to Levi in humbleness of heart, that ye may receive a blessing from his mouth. For he shall bless Israel and Judah, because him hath the Lord chosen to be king over all the nation. And bow down before his seed, for on our behalf it

* The famous allusion to Paul is absent from the ancient Armenian version, and one group of the Greek MSS. makes Benjamin here predict the coming of Jesus, not of Paul.

† R. vi., 8–12.

will die in wars visible and invisible, and will be among you an eternal king."

At the time the book was composed John Hyrcanus was on the throne, " Priest of the Most High God " as he called himself. Unlike most of the literature we are considering, the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs were in favour of the actually reigning government, so that it may be regarded as a piece of what we now call *propaganda*. A few years later everything had changed for the worse. The sons of Hyrcanus were savage tyrants; it was impossible to see in them God's Vicegerents on earth, and pious Jews were driven to look elsewhere for the Heaven-sent Deliverer.

But why is any human Deliverer necessary? Will not our God, they said, Himself deliver us? This is the expectation of the next work we are to consider, called the " Assumption of Moses."

The writer of the " Assumption of Moses " shows us that he knew the history of his nation very well down to the death of Herod the Great, *i.e.* to the Christian Era, but after that his anticipations are not borne out by the event, so that we can date the book soon after C.E. 1.

The most probable date is between C.E. 7 and C.E. 30; in other words, it is just a few years earlier than the events of the Gospel History.

The general interpretation and tendency of the work is quite clear. The "Assumption of Moses" gives the last speech of Moses to Joshua before he is taken up Mount Pisgah to disappear from mortal eyes. As in so many other of the Apocalypses the matter takes the form of a prophetical history of Israel. No names are mentioned, of course—in this pseudonymous literature, the Seers of old are supposed to foretell future *events* and to understand *doctrines*, but they must be silent about *names*—but the Captivity and the Return are clearly indicated. Then follows, according to our Apocalyptist, an evil time. He has no good word for the latter-day rulers of the Jews; first come the Hellenising priests, then kings who will be called "Priests of the Most High God" who will work iniquity,—these, of course, are the Maccabæan Princes,—then an insolent king not of priestly race, *i.e.* Herod the Great, who will play the tyrant. After this the author expects a further persecution, recalling and surpassing the ordeal that the nation went

through in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. When things are at their worst there will be a man of the tribe of Levi, whose name will be Taxo,* who will take his seven sons into the wilderness to fast for three days and then die, rather than transgress the commandments of the Lord of Lords; thereupon the Kingdom of God will appear and Israel will be avenged. For

" The Heavenly One will arise from His royal throne.
" And come forth from His holy habitation
" With indignation and wrath for His sons.

" And earth will tremble to its utmost bounds,
" And the high mountains be brought low and the forests fall;

" The Sun will not give light, and the horns of the Moon will grow dark,
" They will be broken and it will all be turned into blood,
" And the circle of the stars will be shattered;

" The seas will sink into the abyss,
" The fountains of water will fail and the rivers be afraid;

" For the Most High will arise, the Eternal God alone,
" He will come in glory to do vengeance on the Gentiles
" And destroy all their idols.

" Then happy wilt thou be, O Israel! . . ."†

* An acrostic for *Eleazar*, when put back into Hebrew letters.
† *Ass. Moseos* x.

And so in the end God's Chosen People will be exalted to heaven, from whence they will look down in triumph upon all their enemies below.

This is the climax of Moses' prophecy to Joshua. More than any other of the works we are looking at to-day, it gives us the wild hopes of the crowd who listened to John the Baptist and Jesus the Nazarene, and who " thought that the Kingdom of God should immediately appear."* Like so many things that come down to us from the Jews, it is a strange mixture of hope and despair, of prejudice and insight. The writer has little knowledge of history or of the world beyond what he has learnt from his Bible, and, like Tertullian after him, he tells us that a prominent feature of the triumph of the Elect will be the sight of their vanquished enemies. But that will be in the New Age when the End has come. Meanwhile, in the Interim, while the sun and moon still continue, what strikes us in the expectations of the writer of the " Assumption of Moses " is the resemblance to Christian expectations as preserved in the Synoptic Gospels. The Woes on Pharisees and Sadducees alike, the great

* Luke xix., 11.

Tribulation or Trial which lies before the faithful, the hopelessness of resisting evil, the abomination of desolation in the holy place, the flight of the Saints into the wilderness—all the Eschatology of the Gospel except the Central Figure—all these have their parallel in the "Assumption of Moses." And more than this: it is not only in the *mise-en-scène* that we find the analogy. It is in the sacred drama also. The voluntary death of the holy Taxo has a redeeming value, as the author depicts it, for it hastens the End; it is effective, it acts like the death of the son of the Lord of the Vineyard in the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen.* The mental world depicted for us in the Gospels is really strange to us; we are familiar with the scenes from constant repetition, but they are unlike the world we live in. If the message of the Gospel be important for us, if we want to know what the words of Jesus sounded like when they were first uttered, then we must endeavour to put ourselves into the mental attitude of his audience. And I know of no single book that helps one to do this so directly as the "Assumption of Moses."

* Mark xii., 1–11.

Well, the Jewish People about a generation after the Crucification played for the great stake —and lost. In C.E. 66 they went to war with Rome and in C.E. 70 Jerusalem was taken, the Temple was burnt, the sacrificial worship ceased for ever, and the whole organisation of the Jewish State was suppressed. It was a question whether there would be any Jews in the future. Vast numbers were killed or sold as slaves. No doubt many ceased to profess their peculiar religion, or bring up their families as Jews. The future of Judaism depended on an act of will, whether a sufficient number of Jews thought it worth while, in the altered conditions, to keep themselves in their ancestral ways.

That they did so was in the first place due to that great man Johanan ben Zakkai, the chief founder of the Rabbinical Religion and the first organiser of modern Judaism, as it has existed since the collapse of the Jewish State. And in addition to Talmudic sources, which from this point onwards become available, we are fortunate in having two works, the last of the great series of Jewish Apocalypses, which throw a vivid light upon the state of mind of

the Jews who, after the Destruction of Jerusalem, braced themselves to remain loyal to the religion of their fathers, to sit down and adapt the religion and the hopes of Israel to the times of the long dominion of the Gentiles.

The two books are the "Apocalypse of Baruch" and "Second Esdras." There will be no time to-day to consider both of these, so I will pass on at once to the more interesting and original of the pair, the book best known in English as "Second Esdras," or rather Chapters iii.-xiv. of that collection, which form quite a separate work from the chapters that precede and follow, a work which exists apart from them in Oriental versions, and is to be dated soon after the destruction of Jerusalem.

The general point of view of this work is much the same as that of the "Apocalypse of Baruch," but the writer seems to be thinking less of prescribing a line of conduct for others than of puzzling out for himself the balance of right and wrong in this extraordinary world. The world is not as "Ezra" would have wished it: "It were better that we were not here at all, than that we should come hither

and live in the midst of ungodliness, and suffer and know not wherefore."* "Our sanctuary is laid waste, our altar broken down, our temple destroyed; our psaltery is brought low, our song is put to silence, our rejoicing is at an end; the light of our candlestick is put out, the ark of our covenant is spoiled, our holy things are defiled, and the Name that is called upon us is profaned; our freemen are despitefully treated, our priests are burned, our Levites are gone into captivity, our virgins are defiled and our wives ravished; our righteous men are carried away, our little ones betrayed, our young men are brought into bondage, and our strong men are become weak; and, what is more than all, the Seal of Sion—for she hath now lost the seal of her honour, and is delivered into the hands of them that hate us."† Elsewhere Ezra asks "Is there any other nation that knoweth Thee besides Israel? Or what tribes have so believed Thy covenants as Jacob? And yet their reward appeareth not, and their labour hath no fruit: for I have gone hither and thither through the nations, and I see that they abound in good

* IV Ezra iv., 12 † IV Ezra x., 21–23.

things, and think not upon Thy commandments.''*

The angel Uriel comes down to comfort Ezra and instruct him. The message consists of two parts. On the one hand he is assured that in the end good will visibly triumph even in this world. The end is not yet: all time is divided into twelve parts and nine-and-a-half are gone,† and the last 400 years will be taken up with the victorious reign of the Messiah. After that there is a pause of seven days; no man will remain. Then comes the Resurrection and the Judgment and the New World in which good and bad will be rewarded according to their deserts.‡ The Most High hath not made one world, but two.§ On the other hand, Ezra is told, '' The Most High hath made this world for many, but the world to come for few. . . As . . . the earth. . . giveth very much mould whereof earthen vessels are made, and little dust that gold cometh of, even so is the course of the present world. There be many created, but few shall be saved.''‖ And again '' As the husbandman soweth much seed upon the ground

* IV Ezra iii., 32 ff. † IV Ezra xiv., 11 f. ‡ IV Ezra vii., 28–33
§ IV Ezra vii., 50. ‖ IV Ezra viii., 1–3.

and planteth many trees, and yet not all that is sown will come up in due season, neither will all that is planted take root: even so they that are sown in the world will not all be saved.''*

The really interesting thing about this scheme of things is that the revelation does not satisfy Ezra. He says '' I see that the world to come will bring delight to few, but torrents unto many.''† '' O thou earth,'' he cries, '' wherefore hast thou brought forth, if the mind is made out of dust, like as all other created things? For it were better that the dust itself had been unborn, so that the mind might not have been made therefrom. But now the mind groweth with us, and by reason of this we are tormented, because we perish and know it. Let the race of men lament and the beasts of the field be glad: let all that are born lament but let the four-footed beasts and the cattle rejoice. For it is far better with them than with us: for they look not for judgment, neither do they know of torments or of salvation promised unto them after death.‡ And again '' This is my first and last saying, that it had been better that the earth

* IV Ezra viii., 41. † IV Ezra vii., 47.
‡ IV Ezra vii., 62–66.

had not given Adam: or else to have restrained him from sinning. . . . O thou Adam, what hast thou done? for though it was thou that sinned, yet the evil is not fallen on thee alone, but upon all of us that come of thee."*

We have been considering to-night an ancient and far-away literature, but the extracts I have just read have a quite modern ring. They will at least serve to show us that some of the questions that perplex us are not new. Ezra, however, stands alone in his arraignment of Providence, and the rest of the Apocalyptic literature is untroubled by these inward misgivings.

The language of past ages is always strange. It needs some familiarity to understand the idiom, and it needs not only familiarity, but also insight and imagination, so to understand the idiom as to be moved by it. The Jewish Apocalypses are for the most part rough, uncouth writings, full of cloudy pictures of persecution and endurance and ultimate retribution, without much literary charm or grace of diction. Their interest is that they give utterance to the con-

* IV Ezra vii., 46 (116)–48 (118).

viction that animated the Jews in their long struggle with late-Greek Civilisation, when the Jewish Nation as a body had to choose between continuing to serve the God of their fathers and accepting all the benefits, material and intellectual, of a worldly *Kultur*.

Eight years ago there were some who lived through an experience that lit up the meaning of the Jewish expectation of the Judgment to come, as no Commentary could do. Just before the War broke out I had sent a book of mine dealing with this literature to M. Franz Cumont, the Director of the Museum of Antiquities at Brussels, and the greatest living authority on the Mythraic Mysteries and the other cults popular in the Roman Empire during the first centuries of the Christian Era. M. Cumont had to remain in Brussels till the objects under his care were regularly taken over by the German invaders, but early in 1915 he was able to get away and he wrote to me from Rome: " I have just passed (he says) six months in Belgium, and that life in a country under the heel of an invader has put me in the state of mind in which one appreciates the Apocalypses, a vision of Hope, a faith in final

Justice. The Belgians to-day share these sentiments with the author of the 'Book of Enoch.' "

A vision of Hope, faith in final Justice—that is exactly the message of the Jewish Apocalypses. It is a belief that we need to retain if we are to continue to think life worth living and struggling for. And I shall be satisfied if I have succeeded to-day in making some of the words of this old message audible and attractive to you.

LECTURE III

THE JEWS OF BABYLON

BY

ELKAN NATHAN ADLER, M.A.

THE JEWS OF BABYLON

In order to appreciate the relative importance of Babylonian to Jewish history in the First Century, it may be desirable to give the briefest outline of the history of Babylon, immediately preceding the Christian era.

One has heard a good deal lately about the discoveries at Ur of the Chaldees, the traditional home of our race—discoveries, which may even throw into shame the glories of Tutankhamen's Tomb.

Mesopotamia has an unbroken historical record, even longer than that of Egypt. Its language, a kind of Aramaic, was the Court language, and a sort of *lingua franca*, intelligible to Asiatics and Egyptians alike. Thus, Naville's theory that the Pentateuch was originally written in Aramaic on cuneiform tablets, with which Moses must have been familiar, is not so grotesque as it may appear.

The fertile country between the Euphrates and Tigris passed throughout the centuries under the rule of Assyrians, Medes, Persians, Greeks and Seleucid Syrians in turn.

In 140 B.C.E., King Mithridates, the Parthian, threw off the Syrian yoke, and divided his Empire into the Upper and Lower Kingdom—separated by the Caspian Gates—the first of the Lower Kingdoms being Mesopotamia or Babylonia. During the first half of the First Century B.C.E., Parthia first came in contact with Rome. Anybody who has had a schooling in Shakespeare and the Classics knows all about the Parthian Wars.

The unprovoked invasion of Mesopotamia by Crassus, in 53 B.C.E., when he lost his life in battle, was the first Act of the great drama. The conquest by the Parthians of Syria and Palestine in 40 to 38 was the second, Antony's disastrous campaign in Armenia, the third. English people retain a lively impression of that time from their knowledge of Antony and Cleopatra.

For 150 years thereafter, Parthia was subject to internal dissensions, perhaps, but free from the menace of Rome, until, in 114, Trajan renewed hostilities and conquered it in the fol-

lowing year. But the Roman triumph was soon at an end, except for empty victories under Septimius Severus, in 199, and Julian in 363. After 224, the Persian Sassanids ruled the country until the successors of Mahomet established the Caliphate at Bagdad, in the 7th Century.

Throughout the period with which we are immediately concerned, and both before and after, the Euphrates was looked upon, by Rome and Parthia, as a frontier between their Empires. During that time, Greek was the official language of the country, though the people of Babylonia talked what the Talmud calls Babylonian Aramaic.

If one bears in mind the rivalries of the two great powers, Rome and Parthia, so well matched and so jealous of their spheres of influence, one can the better understand the importance of Palestine as a buffer state in the first Century. To this fact was due the constant migration of Jews from Palestine to Babylonia and Babylonia to Palestine, as Roman encroachments waxed and waned.

We are perhaps a little too much inclined to ignore the importance of the Diaspora before

the destruction of the Temple. Palestine was peopled by only a minority of the Jews. Most of them had stayed in Mesopotamia and the rest of Parthia, or spread into Galilee, Syria, Egypt and beyond the seas, so that in the Second Century B.C.E., the Jewish Sibyl says of the Diaspora: "Every land is full of thee and every sea," Strabo, Philo, Seneca and the author of the Acts of the Apostles prove that the Jewish race was disseminated in those times over the whole of the civilised world. Philo says that in Egypt alone there were over a million Jews—an eighth of the whole population. Even Cicero with his *auri illa invidia Judæi* exaggerates, like any Chesterton or Belloc of to-day, the wealth and power of the Jew.

Seventy years after the exile to Babylon, a partial return to Palestine took place in four batches; under Cyrus and Zerubbabel in 536, under Darius and Haggai in 519 (when the second Temple was built), under Artaxerxes and Ezra in 458, and under Nehemiah in 445. But Jews did not come to Palestine in any large numbers, hardly more than one hears of to-day, when the immigration into Palestine is so jealously restricted.

We are told that only 42,360 in all returned to Palestine under Cyrus. The bulk of the captivity remained in Babylon and considered themselves the pick of Jewry. They were prosperous and contented, and many of them occupied official positions and were highly placed. Not only the stay-at-homes but those who returned to the Holy Land, with the religious isolation they had learnt in captivity, refused to recognise the mixed multitudes in Jerusalem and around as members of their own community. For centuries thereafter, as one can tell from several passages in Mishna and Talmud, to be recognised as of good family one had to be of Babylonian origin.

At the same time the Babylonians themselves were not all so blue-blooded. For, in the 4th Chapter of *Quiddushin* (71a) the Babylonians who returned to Palestine in the reign of Cyrus are described as of ten categories *Asarah Yohasin*, Priests, Levites, Israelites, Mean Priests, Proselytes, Freedmen, Illegitimates, *Shetuqi*, of unknown fatherhood, *Nethinim* and Foundlings.

There were elaborate rules to determine the comparitive purity of the race. Professor

Büchler has a long and interesting article upon "Familien Reinheit und Familien Makel" in the *Schwarze Festschrift*, in which he investigates the safeguards taken to protect the purity of the lineage of the Priests, the first of the ten categories set forth in Hillel's Mishna. For this Mishna is one of those which can be almost certainly ascribed to him. The discussion of *Is-ah* or dough—a baker's simile expressive of adulteration of the fine flour of family is enlightening. In the comparative degrees of this dough, Babylon is first, Palestine second and the rest of the world nowhere. But like other aristocrats, these tenth transmitters of a foolish face were not conspicuous for learning or intelligence.

Hillel, the illustrious Babylonian immigrant to Palestine in the 1st Century, is the first Babylonian scholar of whom we hear for four centuries since the time of Ezra, and of whom and his doctrine we shall have more to say later on. In *Aboth* the Ethics of the Fathers (1, 13; 11, 6) his maxims are given in Aramaic, which is never the case with regard to his great opponent, Shammai. This shows that in Palestine at that time he was exceptional among the

Rabbis as talking Aramaic. The *Aboth de R. Nathan* (Chapter 12) shows this expressly. It says of him "he also spake in the Babylonian tongue four things." And the maxims ascribed to Ben He He (also attributed to Hillel) are in the same language. It differed, though not very greatly, from the Aramaic spoken in the rest of Palestine, but the language of the Mishna in general is pure Hebrew, a classical sort of learned Latin never spoken by the people. Hillel, the Babylonian, always laid stress on the vernacular. In *Edyoth** he says, "A man must speak in his master's language," and by this he meant not Shammai and Abtalion, the Palestinians, but some unknown teacher of his in Babylon who must have known much, for Hillel knew much when he came to the Holy Land. Perhaps, therefore, we were a little unjust, just now, when we spoke slightingly of Babylonian learning.

In Acts ii., 9, we see that the Apostles in Jerusalem spoke divers languages: "And how hear we every man in our own tongue wherein we were born? Parthians and Medes and Elamites and the dwellers in Mesopotamia and

* Edyoth i, 3. *See* Rev. 38,

in Judea and Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Egypt and in the parts of Lybia about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and Proselytes, Cretes and Arabians, we do hear them speak in our tongues the wonderful works of God."

This is the only reference in the New Testament to the Babylonians of the first Century, except at the end of the 5th Chapter of I. Peter where there is reference to the " Church that is at Babylon." The two passages in Revelations, xiv. 8, and xvii. 8, about Babylon the Great are merely adaptations of Isaiah xxi. 9, and Jeremiah li. 8 and do not refer to contemporary Babylon.

While the Holy Land retained its independence, with Jerusalem as a spiritual centre for all Jewry, the Babylonian Jews who remained in the *Golah* (captivity) profited by the recognition of their nationality. They cultivated their fields, homes and gardens (see Jeremiah xxix. 5). Their King and the governing classes generally treated them with tolerance and respect. The general population was friendly disposed. At any rate in the first Century, we can find no trace of the religion of Parthia in their Judaism. Their material progress seems to

have been great. They were wealthy and generously and gladly contributed to Palestinian needs. The government, unlike the Roman, put no restriction on their export of bullion for such purposes. The famous passage in Cicero's oration " Pro Flacco " shows the contrast. Flaccus had been accused of robbing the Jews of their gold. " Nay," said Cicero, " we duly informed the authorities and it was right on his part to prevent gold from leaving the Roman dominions." They regularly forward to the Holy Land their Tithes and *Terumah* and half shekels (*see Yadaim* iv. 3), although their first-born cattle were not accepted (*Halla* iii. 2). They regularly made their pilgrimage to Jerusalem (*Yoma* 66 b.) and had a village of their own, *Khefar hababli*. Unlike their brethren in Egypt, who developed some sort of religious autonomy, their religion was entirely dependent on Palestine, and its supreme Court, the Great Sanhedrin. Their genealogy remained pure, their priests were recognised as unexceptionable, the fact that a Cohen was admitted to *Duchan* and pronounced the priestly benediction in a Babylonian Synagogue was accepted as evidence of his eligibility

to service in the Temple (*see Tosefta Pea* iv. *Khetuboth* 25a *Quiddushin* 71a). But this close dependence on Palestine had a bad effect on their spiritual activities, and, as we have said, with Ezra and Nehemiah their literary output came to an end.

They were warlike, and their military services were often called into requisition. Thus Josephus records (Ant. xii. 3-4) that Antiochus the Great, "King of Asia," writes to Zeuxas, *c.* 190 B.C.E., "Seditions having arisen in Phrygia and Lydia. . . . I have thought proper to transplant from Babylon and Mesopotamia 2,000 Jewish families with their effects, into Phrygia to do duty in the garrisons, as I am convinced of their fidelity, both from the principles of their religion and the service they have rendered my predecessors. Wherefore I order that you immediately remove them, promising them the full enjoyment of their own laws and customs. When they arrive, you shall give them lands and inheritances, that they may build, plant and cultivate the ground. . . ; be careful that these people remain unmolested." (*Cf.* II. Macc. viii. 20, where Judas inspires his army by telling them of "the

battle that they had in Babylon with the Galatians, how they came but 8,000 in all to the business with 4,000 Macedonians and that, the Macedonians being perplexed, the 8,000 destroyed an 120,000 because of the help that they had from Heaven, and so received a great booty.'')

With the conquest of Babylonia by Mithridates about thirty years later, the Jews there came under Parthian rule, and Josephus (Ant. xiii. 16) quotes Nicolas Damascenus as his authority for an invasion of Parthia by Antiochus Sidetes, in which Hyrcanus I. (175-104), the Jewish King High Priest, was his ally. They marched together and, after a victory in 129 B.C.E., both armies halted for two days by the River Lycus (Zab) to enable the Jews duly to celebrate the Feast of Pentecost. Herod, too, employed Babylonian Jewish mercenaries in his campaign in Trachonitis. Asinai and Anilai were the runaway boys of a widow of Nahardea. Reproved for laziness by the weaver to whom they were apprenticed, they collected a band of discontented Jews in a sort of Adullam's Cave in the forks of the Euphrates, levied blackmail on the shepherds,

and after conquering the Parthian King, Artabanus III, he made them his allies and governors. Their downfall came through the intermarriage of Anilai with a Parthian idolatress, who murdered her brother-in-law. The Haggadist Tanhum b. Hamilai was his son. This episode is a tribute to Jewish military genius, but it was not appreciated by the Rabbis, many of whom emigrated to Palestine in consequence of the disturbed state of the country; nor did it make the Jews liked by their neighbours. When Anilai fell, the Babylonian hatred of the Jew broke out and the Jews had to flee from *pogroms* to Seleucia. Hyrcanus II., High Priest from 79-40, was less fortunate. He had been befriended by Julius Cæsar, but, after Cæsar's death, was defeated and taken prisoner by the Parthians, and had his ears cut off. Thereafter, however, he was treated kindly by their King Phraates and with great honour. Herod, with motives not above suspicion, invited him to return to Jerusalem. Josephus (Ant. xv. 2) tells us that Phraates "gave a remission to Hyrcanus whom the Jews in Babylon had supplied with money and all other necessaries for his journey, and he re-

paired to Jerusalem. . . Herod assigned to him the most distinguished place at all public meetings and entertainments and called him and treated him as his father. . . Nothing seemed now to be wanting to the confirmation of Hyrcanus in the office of High Priest. . . Herod, however, determined that no man of distinguished extraction should be High Priest and sent to Babylon for Ananel, a person of inferior degree and caused him to be promoted to that distinguished honour.'' Perhaps Josephus does Herod an injustice in attributing Hyrcanus's failure to be restored to the High Priesthood as due to Herod's jealousy. Was he not precluded from office by reason of his blemish—the loss of his ears? His wife induced Cleopatra to intervene with Antony in his favour, and as a result of her influence, their son Aristobulus, a lad of eighteen, was made High Priest, but drowned soon after (Bel. Jud. 113). To this Ananel there occurs an allusion in Mishna *Parah. IIIb* where Ananel the *Egyptian* is mentioned as one of the High Priests who burnt the red heifer once during his pontificate. The description of him as an Egyptian and not a Babylonian need not disturb

us. It is not an isolated instance, and points to the fact that the Palestinians were prejudiced against foreigners, and Babylonians and Egyptians were indiscriminately charged with faults in taste and character. The Talmud Babli, however, often substitutes, in such a case, Egyptian for Babylonian as the nationality of the culprit. Thus, of the scapegoat, the Mishna (*Yoma* 66 a-b) tells that a high gangway had to be constructed so that the Babylonians should not be able to pull the goat's hair—a rude habit of theirs. Rabah bar bar Hanah says they were not Babylonians but Alexandrians, but as people hated Babylonians they called these (boors) by their name. We have learnt (in a *Boraitha*) that R. Juda says they were not Babylonians but Alexandrians. Then said R. Jose to him " may you have peace of mind as you have given me peace of mind." Jose was R. Josef Halafta who was of Babylonian origin. He was a member of the Usha Sanhedrin and author of one of our earliest histories—the *Seder Olam Rabba.* Because of his origin he was very sensitive when imputations were made against Babylonians. Similarly we are told (*Menahoth* 99b) that, when

the Day of Atonement fell on a Friday and the sin offering had to be eaten next day but could not be cooked, the Babylonians used to eat it raw and uncooked " for they had a good digestion." Again says R. Jose, they were really Alexandrians, not Babylonians, but Babylonians are unpopular!

Considerable light is thrown upon the relations between the Jews of Babylon and the Holy Land by references in Mishna and Talmud, some of which have obvious reference to a period before the destruction of the Temple. In Temple times the Jews of the Diaspora endeavoured, as regularly as they could, to perform the pilgrimage to Jerusalem on the three High Festivals of the year.

They contributed to the upkeep of the Temple by paying their tithes and half shekels and transmitting the money to Palestine. Palestine for its part allocated to itself the right of fixing the calendar for all the Jews. When the season was late and there had been a cold winter, it became necessary to have an extra month, an intercalary month. The only man that could properly fix this was the *Nasi* (Prince). Thus, in an interesting passage in

Sanhedrin iib., we read how the *Nasi*, Rabbi Gamaliel the First, on such an occasion dictated three letters to his scribe John, "the first to our brethren in Upper and Lower Galilee, the second to our brethren in the South," and then he goes on to say: "And take a third letter and write to our brethren, the sons of the Captivity in Babylon, and to our brethren in Media, and to all the Captivity of Israel. May our peace increase for ever. We give notice unto you and it seemeth good in our sight and in the sight of our colleagues that we add to this year 30 days." The text of this pastoral is about the year 40 B.C.E.

In *Yebamoth*, chapter 16, we read that Rabbi Akiba was sent to Nahardea to fix the Leap Year. He went on a similar mission to other parts of the Diaspora, such as Media and Asia Minor. The emissary chosen was always a great scholar, who would be able to give replies to religious enquiries generally.

It is curious to watch the rivalry between the Jews of Babylon and those of the Holy Land. Some instances have already been referred to. Not unnaturally, their respective Talmuds take in general a partisan view of their own, and

although the redaction of the Talmuds only took place three or four centuries later, it must be remembered that the dicta incorporated therein are much earlier and may fall well within our own period. It is natural to find that the Babylonian Talmud exalts the Babylonian Jew; thus, in *Khetuboth* 110b. we are told that " to leave Babylon is to break a commandment," " to live in Babylon is the same as to live in the Holy Land." In fact it is a *mitzvah* (duty) to live there. In 111a. we are further told that to be buried in Babylon is as meritorious as to be buried in the Holy Land. The Jewish inhabitants of Babylon regarded themselves as of purer race than the Palestinians and, after the fall of Jerusalem, they thought themselves the genuine Israel, and, where their traditions differed from those of Palestine, these were cherished as being of higher authority. (See *Qiddushin* 29b.).

On the other hand, the Jerusalem Talmud gives the preference to Palestine. In *Jer. Khetuboth* xii. 35a. we are told that the Resh Gola Huna, in accordance with his wish, was buried in the Holy Land. In *Jer. Sheqalim* ii. 47c. Babylon is regarded as

" foreign " or " abroad," in contradistinction to Palestine. In *Jer. Pesahim* v. 3 (32a.) we read of the tradition that it is wrong to teach a Babylonian or a Southerner (*Daromi*) Aggada, for they are proud and of little learning.*

Sometimes, however, we find traces even in the Talmud Babli of Palestinian prejudice against Babylon. Thus in *Yebamoth* 17a. Babel is declared to be synonymous with *Sheol*.

After the destruction of the Temple, the rivalry became increasingly bitter and we meet with constant Palestinian gibes. " Why," asks Rabbi Johanan, " is it called Babel "? " Because of its confusion about Talmud and Mishna." " He hath set me in dark places as they that be dead of old " (Lam. 3,6.) In the schools of Palestine, people are gentle and courteous, but the Babylonians dispute most bitterly and often come to blows. (See *Sanhedrin* 24a.)

Again, in *Sabbath* 145b., the Babylonians, says Rabbi Hanina, are distinguished by their dress for they are no scholars! In *Succoth* 28a. even Abaye and Rabba are described as of little importance when contrasted with the mystics of Palestine.

* Cf. B.T. *Pes.* 62. b.

But sometimes the Palestinian Jews appear to have preferred Babylonians to their own countrymen. Thus, we are told that King Herod favoured Bathera because he was a Babylonian. And no Babylonian ever had more honour outside his own country than Hillel, Saint and Sage. Hillel was a Babylonian of the family of David. His brother Shebna was a merchant.* In the year 40 B.C.E. he went to Palestine to study biblical exposition, under Shemaiah and Abtalion (*Pes.* 70b.). In the Holy Land he suffered great poverty (*Yoma* 35b.) until the sons of Bathera resigned in his favour and he became President of the Beth Din.

As contrasted with his great hard-shell opponent or rival, Shammai, his administration was liberal and encouraging, and in the best sense, worldly wise. A foreigner himself, he was inclined to lessen the rigour of the rules, which made life, according to the law, so difficult for foreigners and for proselytes. His *Prosbul*, or Regulation, lightened the rigour of the Jubilee year (*Sheb.* 10, 3.). He gave due weight to social amenities or *tiqun haolam.*

* Sota 21a; R.E.J. *31*, 202–11, *33*, 1–43.

The production by an Alexandrian of his mother's *Ketubah* or Marriage Contract, he regarded as sufficient legitimation. (*Tosef Ket.* iv. 9, *Bab. Mez.* 104a.)

His own lineage is testified by Josephus (*Vita* 38). He speaks of Hillel's great grandson Simeon ben Gamaliel I. as belonging to a great family.

Naturally the Talmud of Babylon is richer in tradition with regard to Hillel than that of Jerusalem. Hillel the Saint is the typical Hasid. He is the first of the types of Jewish Palestinian piety, so attractively portrayed to us in Professor Büchler's recent book, which I venture to call the best of the Jews' College publications.

Hillel's death occurred at the very beginning of the First Century. Of him it was said, "When once the elders went into the house of Gadia in Jericho, a heavenly voice (*Bath Qol*) came forth and said to them 'There is among you a man worthy of the Holy Spirit, only the generation is not worthy of it,'" all eyes turned towards Hillel the elder. When he died they bewailed him thus: "Woe for the humble, the saint, the disciple of Ezra." No mean praise,

when it is remembered that Hillel was not a true-born Palestinian, but had come there from Babylonia, which in his days had not yet become distinguished for its output of scholars.

Büchler says that, as Hillel's worthiness of the Holy Spirit is contrasted with the unworthiness of his contemporaries, it would appear that his colleagues, constituting the authoritative religious body, did not sufficiently appreciate his great qualities and did not think him worthy of the position which he was holding. Perhaps this was when he first became President of the Beth Din, when he had quite accidentally, by answering the practical question about the admissibility of the Passover sacrifice on the Sabbath, been elected in the place of the sons of Bethera. As a disciple of Ezra, he is described as a great scholar who restored the right observance of the Torah.

He was distinguished for his humility and used to say " My humiliation is my elevation, my elevation is my humiliation." He was constantly insulted for his foreign origin, thus in *Jer. Pesah*, vi. 33a., 22, " We have already said that we have no use for a Babylonian," and again 38, " Who hath caused you to lead this

Babylonian?" and again (A.R.N. 12, 28a): "The silly Babylonian."

His loving-kindness was another characteristic. Of him Rabbi Meir said "He loveth God and he loveth mankind"; he always attributed good motives to the actions of others.

But Hillel was no Uriah Heep. Another side of his character is revealed by his rule, "If I am not for myself, who is for me? But if I am only for myself, what am I? and if not now, when?"

In practical life some egoism is necessary, but only by thinking of others and working for others can one rise to be a man.

It was Hillel that said "Never judge your fellow man till you are in his position." "Do not separate from the congregation, and never trust yourself till you die." "Love peace and pursue it." "Study and learn, for kindness and love alone can not enable one to reach the full degree of moral excellence."

But if Hillel was great, *Beth Hillel* was still greater. That was the school he founded. Of his 80 scholars, 30 were deemed worthy that God's glory should rest on them as on our teacher Moses (only their generation was not

worthy of it). Thirty were worthy that the sun should stop for them as it stopped for Joshua. This meant worthy of the privilege of being prince or patriarch and so entitled to regulate the calendar. Only a quarter were men of average capacity. The greatest were Johanan ben Zakkai, who saved Judaism after the Roman debacle of 70, and Jonathan ben Uzziel. These two were the Rabbis recorded by Josephus as leaders of the revolt against placing the Roman eagle on the Temple gate.

Almost as distinguished a teacher as Hillel was Akiba ben Joseph (50 to 135). Graetz describes him as beyond doubt the most gifted and influential of the Tanaim. Much legendary material clusters round his early history. He was a great traveller. He went to Rome in the autumn of 95 as one of an embassy to dissuade Domitian from a cruel edict, only stopped by the Emperor's death.

At Rome he was in favour at the Court of the Emperor Nerva, where Domitian's nephew, Flavius Clemens, and the famous Aquila, afterwards Akiba's pupil, became proselytes. But when Trajan succeeded, bad times arose for the Jews, and he returned to Palestine. Thence

he went to Babylon and preached and taught in Nehardea (*cf. Yebamoth ad fin*).

Before the outbreak of the Bar Cochba's rebellion, Akiba made a final journey to Parthia and Asia Minor and spread the Messianic —pseudo-Messianic—propaganda, preaching against Hadrian and his legions. The disastrous failure of the rebellion resulted in Akiba's imprisonment and execution by the Romans. He largely modified Jewish thought and was not without influence on the early Christians.

He was, of course, much opposed to the new Christian heresy, and so it is not surprising that Jerome puts him at the head and front of the offending Rabbis.

With mysticism and gnosticism Akiba had no sympathy. He laid down seven rules of interpretation of Scripture tending to find therein the justification and authority for all the Oral Law. He gave the solid rock of Scripture as the foundation of the structure of all observances, rules and usages prevalent in his time, and at the same time enabled his pupils and followers to build up afresh. Some of his *logia* are found in the third Chapter of Aboth, but his ethics

were scattered throughout the Talmud and Midrash. He was very hard upon passionate anger. Like Hillel, his great principle was that of Leviticus *19*, 18, " Love thy neighbour as thyself."

With characteristic ingenuity he applies this to marriage, and warns people against an unequal match as offending against this principle. Of the Medians he remarks three things that please him much. They carve at table, they kiss the hand only, and their meetings are in the open field. These preferences reflect his fears as a conspirator against Rome. With regard to diet he advised (*Sanh.* 17 v.), " Live only in a city where there is fruit, for fruit is good for the eyes. He that eats food that disagrees with him transgresses three commandments. He disgraces himself, he disgraces the food, and he makes a *Berakhah* (blessing) in vain."

" Shameful is he who allows his daughter to remain at home unmarried."

" Take heed of him who gives advice without being asked for it."

Rabbi Nathan " Ha Babli " migrated to the Holy Land just after the end of the First

Century. He was the son of the Exilarch and perhaps because of this distinction was appointed Rosh Beth Din, under Simon b. Gamaliel II.* in Usha. He is said to be the author of the Aboth de R. Nathan—a *Tosefta* (homily) to the Ethics of the Fathers. His chief rival was the Patriarch R. Judah ha Nasi, whom he assisted in compiling the Mishna. The Palestinians were jealous and taunted him "because thy father's belt helped thee to be President, must we make thee *Nasi*?"

Issi ben Judah, probably identical with Jose b. Judah of Khefar ha Babli, was another contemporary worthy.

Jose b. Halafta, another member of the Usha Beth Din, was also of Babylonian origin and, as we have seen, very sensitive when imputations were made on Babylonians.

When the Temple was destroyed, Judah b. Bathyra established himself in Nisibis and Gamaliel's pupil Nehemiah in Nehardea where, as we read in *Ycbamoth* 122a., Akiba consulted him.

Many Babylonian Rabbis, like Hillel and Judah b. Bathera had gone to Palestine to visit

* *See* Horyoth 13 B, Baba Quama 53 A.

the *Yeshiboth* (Rabbinic Colleges) there, and it is owing to the experience thus acquired that Babylon was able to replace Palestine after the downfall of the Jewish State.

The Jews of Babylon retained complete religious autonomy and, in all cases between Jews, their Sanhedrins were competent to the exclusion of the civil courts. Their *Yeshiboth* or Academies were the guides of their spiritual life. Their lay head was the Exilarch or *Reshgola*. The Academies in Babylonia with which we are chiefly concerned were Nehardea, the main seat of learning, which was visited by Akiba, Nisibis in the extreme north of Mesopotamia, the head of which was Judah b. Bathera, and where many refugees from Palestine came after the destruction of the Temple, and Nahar Pekod, founded by the ambitious Haninah. He was a refugee of Palestine about this time and started to found an independent Sanhedrin of his own. But his ambitions were rudely checked by the Palestine Sanhedrin, reconstituted in Usha in the Holy Land, after the troubles of 70 had quieted down.

The great *Yeshibah* of Sura was founded by Rab on his return to Babylon in 219 and it

started the dominant rule of Babylonian Academies. That of Pumbadita replaced Nehardea under the presidency of Samuel, Rab's great colleague.

Mahuza was also founded about the same time. The organisation of the *Yeshiba* or *Metibta* is well known. The head was *Resh Sidra*, then came seven *Roshe Kallah* and three *Haberim*. These ten sat on the first of a semi-circular row, and behind each *Resh Kallah* sat ten *Allufim*, and these seventy made up the Sanhedrin in Babylonia. The *Kallah* used to assemble twice a year in Ellul and Adar, and its functions correspond somewhat with the Ecclesiastical Assemblies with which we are familiar in the Church of England.

But, after matters had somewhat quieted down, the Jews, with their never-dying love of the Holy Land, commenced to return there, and the Academy at Usha, as we have seen, was established, and lost no time in establishing its precedence over all the *Golah*, including Babylon and the Palestinian Rabbis who had been translated, and who "lost by translation."

During the persecution under Hadrian, the Jewish ecclesiastical functions in Palestine were

temporarily suspended and Hanina went to Babylonia, apparently to Nahar Pekod, on one of the canals, and established a Beth Din there for calendar and other purposes; but when the troubles abated the Palestinians reconstituted their *Beth Din* at Usha in Galilee in the year 137. In *Berakhoth* (63a.) we are told how two distinguished delegates were sent from Palestine to Hanina to stop him from further encroachment on Palestinian privilege.

The text is vivid and reads as follows:—

Berakoth 63a. When Hanina, R. Joshua's brother's son, went to the Gola (in Babylon) he proceeded to fix the calendar for the Diaspora. Usha sent after him two scholars, R. Jose b. Kaiphar and the grandson of Zachary b. Kabatel. When he saw them he asked, " Why have ye come?" They replied " To learn Torah." He cried out " These men are great in their generation and their fathers served in the Temple, for we have learnt Zachary b. Kabatel saith ' often have I read to him (the High Priest) out of the Book of Daniel.' " Hanina proceeded to deliver judgments, but when he pronounced aught unclean they pronounced it clean, what he forbade they per-

mitted. He cried out " these men are vain and naught." But they said, " thou hast built up and canst not pull down, thou hast made a fence and canst not break through." Then said he: " But why do you declare pure what I declare impure, why do ye forbid what I allow?" They answered: " Because thou hast fixed the calendar." He said: " But did not Akiba b. Joseph when outside the Holy Land fix the calendar for the Diaspora?" They replied: " Leave R. Akiba out of the question, for he hath not left his equal in Palestine." Then said he: " But I, too, have left no equal in Palestine." They answered: " The kids you left have become goats, they have horns and have sent us unto you, and thus said they unto us ' Go and tell him in our name that, if he obey, it is well, but if not, he shall be excomunicate; and tell our brethren of the Diaspora that, if they obey, it is well, but if not, let them ascend a high place, let Ahya build an altar, let Hanina play the harp, let them all deny God and say they have no portion in the God of Israel. Forthwith the people began to weep and said ' God forbid but we have a portion in the God of Israel.'

And why all this? for it is written, " the Law shall go forth from Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem."

The mutiny was thus quelled and honour was satisfied. Hanina bowed to authority, but it speaks well for the sincerity of the Rabbis and Pharisees of his time that, notwithstanding his rebuff, his Talmudic teaching was accepted as decisive even in the Holy Land, which, until the end of the Second Century, remained the land of the Halacha and the home of tradition. It was only in the Third Century that Babylon Rabbis became really pre-eminent in the Oral Law, which they expounded and expanded.

LECTURE IV

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PHARISAISM

BY

THE REV. R. TRAVERS HERFORD, B.A.

Author of "Pharisaism, its Aim and its Method," etc.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PHARISAISM*

By R. Travers Herford, B.A.

The survival of Judaism down to the present, as a strong and living religion, is a fact whose reality cannot be denied, whose importance can hardly be over-estimated, but whose meaning presents a question to which no conclusive answer has yet been given. In that answer, if it can be found, lies the significance of Pharisaism. It may be that no conclusive answer can be given, and that the truth is known only to God. Be that as it may, and without claiming in the slightest degree any prophetic knowledge, I think it is possible to make some nearer approach to a solution of this problem than, so far as I know, has yet been made. And the attempt to do so is what I wish to put before you.

* This Essay forms part of a forthcoming work by the Author, entitled *The Pharisees*. It is included in the present volume by his permission.

I have come to the view which I shall set forth, from the study of Pharisaism; and Pharisaism is, if not the key to the whole matter, an essential factor in the case. I have called my subject "The Significance of Pharisaism in the Religious Development of Mankind."

The Judaism which has survived is in all essentials Pharisaism, though no longer usually called by that name. The Pharisees, as known under that name, were the men who chiefly enabled Judaism to survive.

The survival of Judaism is not merely the continued existence of an ancient religion down to our own time, comparable, let us say, with the religion of China, by what might be called devout inheritance. It is the survival of an ancient religion in the presence of a younger religion which claims to have superseded it. The problem becomes acute when it is stated as that of the relation of Judaism to Christianity. So closely related in origin, so sharply opposed in their subsequent history, each having a truth which it holds to be from God, these two confront each other after nineteen centuries, with all the memories of those centuries in their mind, and no nearer to a recon-

ciliation than they were at the beginning. Certainly a strange and, at first sight, a perplexing fact; but on closer examination it will be found, if I am right, to disclose a meaning far other than what appears on the surface. It is this deeper meaning which I shall try to bring out.

In order to do so, I must first prepare the way by some preliminary remarks on certain main features of the Pharisaic and Rabbinic Judaism which has survived. It is manifestly impossible in one lecture to go into detail upon a subject so great; and besides, I am not lecturing on Pharisaism in general, but upon the significance of that form of Judaism as shown by its survival. Yet it should be possible to present in a few words those features which are of special importance for the purpose in hand. (For the rest, I refer to my book on Pharisaism, soon, I hope, to be replaced by a fuller and more thorough treatment of the whole subject, which I have just completed.)

Pharisaism, following on the lines of Ezra, took its stand on the Torah as the supreme revelation given by God to Israel. The Torah, as they understood it, was not so much the written

text of the Pentateuch as the full meaning therein contained. That meaning was drawn forth from it by right interpretation, and the literal sense was enlarged by the application to it of the oral tradition. The meaning was inexhaustible; it never could be and never has been so defined that it would be possible to say " just so much and no more is what the Torah teaches."

To tie it down to an ascertained meaning was the line which the Sadducees took; and they failed to survive, very largely in consequence of so doing.

The Torah, as the name implies, denotes Teaching, not Law. And in the Torah was to be found all that God had taught to mankind in general, though only Israel had received it. And the one thing above all others that the Torah taught, according to the Pharisees, was the will of God. He, the One Supreme, Holy, righteous, wise, good and loving, had made known to His children His will; only by doing His will could He be truly served. The way of life in which a good man should walk consisted in doing the divine will, for no other reason than that of loving obedience to Him

whose will it was. To do any act merely because it was prescribed was not of any religious or moral value; there must be the intention of serving God by that act: it must be, so far as it went, a consecration of self in that particular instance to the service of God. Of course, the Pharisees were not the first to dwell on the duty of obedience to the divine will. The principle is laid down already in " Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy might." The Prophets, whatever else they were, were preachers of righteousness, proclaiming that of God and demanding that of men. They insisted always that God could only be served by the doing of right; and they were severe on the sins and back-slidings of the people.

The prophets had spoken, but the people had not taken to heart their message. Yet, though not regarded at the time, their words were not forgotten; and, after the Exile had read its tremendous lesson to Israel, those who chiefly shaped the character of Judaism in the succeeding centuries laid a quite new stress upon the duty of practical righteousness. This was the idea which inspired the reform of Ezra, and

found expression in his proclamation of the Torah as the sole guide and authority for the religious life of the Jewish people. The lead of Ezra was followed by the Sopherim, and later by the Pharisees, who, by expanding the conception of Torah in the way already indicated, carried the principle of Ezra to its full extent.

All the religious teaching given by these successive leaders had for its object to put the lessons of the Prophets into practice; they were not content that the people should merely hear and admire prophetic eloquence and then turn away and go on as they had done. The time for that was gone; now the people must take most seriously in hand the duty of really and truly obeying the will of God in their everyday life.

Judaism thus became intensely practical, at all events for those who followed the lead of the Pharisees and accepted their teaching.

There was no breach whatever between the Prophets and the Pharisees as regards the end in view; there was a difference of method, and that difference consisted largely in this, that the Pharisees gave definite guidance in ascertaining what the will of God was, in this or that set of

circumstances, while the Prophets had given only general teaching, not defining its application to particular cases. The prophetic teaching was the grandest that had ever been given, and the only thing left to those who came after, was to apply it. Pharisaism, if I may define it in a phrase, is "applied prophecy." The Pharisees had before them the same ideal of faithful service of the One supreme and righteous God, and they succeeded to a far greater extent than the Prophets had done in making that ideal part of the conscious thought and determined choice of the people, and there it has remained ever since. That wonderful tenacity of religious and moral purpose which is to be seen in Judaism in all its subsequent history is largely due to the persistent efforts of the Pharisees and the Rabbis of later times. Their whole system of religious teaching is only then rightly judged when it is regarded as a discipline of character, under the direction of the Torah, having for its object the doing of right acts and the consecration of self to God and His service.

The method of the Pharisees was to seek and to teach a more or less complete and exact definition of the will of God in reference to cases

where action was called for. They had always before them the question "What is the will of God in such and such a case?" They looked for the answer in the Torah, that being their supreme authority, and they found the answer either in what was expressly written, or in what could be deduced from it when rightly interpreted. The answer when found would obviously serve for guidance in similar cases which might arise. Such an answer, such a particular definition of the divine will in a given case, was called a Halachah; and it was called so because it was a direction to a man how he should walk—*halach*. The whole object of the Pharisaic discipline was to define the *way* of the perfect life. The Halachah, as a system, is the whole elaborate minute definition of right action as it was afterwards codified in the Mishnah and enlarged in the Talmud.

The Halachah is beyond any question the most characteristic feature of Pharisaism; and, unless its intention and meaning be understood, the significance of the conclusion to which I am gradually leading up will not be apparent. I must, therefore, dwell for a few minutes upon the nature of the Halachah. It was a system

of definition of the divine will as made known in the Torah, and it was given as guidance in the doing of such acts as would be pleasing to God.

This definition was arrived at not by each individual for himself, but by the combined deliberation of those who were recognised as the leaders of the community, "had in honour of all the people," as Gamaliel was, by reason of their wisdom, learning and piety. They acted for the community, and what they gave was binding on the community; it was in some respects the enactment of laws for the regulation of life, social and individual; and it depended for its constraining power upon the assent and general sanction of the community, to the extent, in the last resort, of exclusion from the community if the law were not obeyed. The Halachah was, however, at no time the rigid cast-iron system which it is commonly supposed to have been, though only by non-Jewish critics. It was always capable of modification, and in fact was modified from time to time. But it was, and was deliberately intended to be, a system whereby constraint was imposed upon individual action in many particulars. Its purpose was to train the individual in the doing of

right actions. It was based upon the assumption that man is a free moral agent, capable of distinguishing between right and wrong, and of choosing the right by the exercise of his own will. The Halachah was wholly religious and wholly moral. What are distinguished in other systems as religion and morality are in Pharisaism one and the same. All turns upon the doing of right actions; all turns upon serving God. That is the *sine qua non* of Pharisaism, as a system. And accordingly it is a system possessing strongly-marked features which make it very unlike other systems. It placed the doing of the divine will before everything else; that first, no matter what might be second. It necessarily laid the greatest stress upon *doing* this and that, and therefore it laid itself open to misconstruction by those who could see the outward act but could not see the inward intention and motive of the act. And it regarded the conscious *act* as the decisive test of a man's worth in the sight of God, the real expression of his true character.

Such, in a few words, was what the Pharisees held and taught, and on those lines they moulded the Judaism of their time so far as they

could influence it. That they had very considerable influence as leaders and friends of the people is admitted by everyone, and is clearly shown by the fact that the Judaism which survived was essentially Pharisaism.

I have now to place alongside of it the religion which began on Jewish ground but within a very short time was carried out into the Gentile world and found there almost the whole of its adherents, *viz.* Christianity. My object, as I may remind you, is to study the relation between these two religions, not merely to set off one in comparison or contrast with the other. There are, of course, very many different types of Christianity, based on doctrinal or ecclesiastical distinctions; but for my present purpose it will not be necessary to go into these. I shall consider only the fundamental character of Christianity as it was first preached by the missionaries of the Church, the character which, apart from modern developments, it still has for the great majority of Christians. That fundamental characteristic is Faith in a Person—the person, of course, being the founder. The message with which the first preachers of Christianity went forth was

"*Believe* in the Lord Jesus and thou shalt be saved." And that, with whatever variation of accent and emphasis, is still its message. The Catholic Church offers salvation to those who enter it, and denies it to all who remain outside; and the Catholic Church claims Jesus as its founder and the Holy Ghost as its constant guide. The Protestant Churches, for the most part, offer salvation and make the essential condition of it faith in Christ. Here, then, we have a type of religion which is fundamentally different from Judaism. It is true, of course, that Christianity took over certain very important Jewish elements, notably the Jewish Scriptures, and substantially the Jewish ethics, a fact of which I shall make use when I come to drawing conclusions. But that which was original to Christianity and distinctive of it, was that it laid the chief stress upon Faith in Christ. That before anything else, no matter what might be put in the second place. Moreover, it offered salvation, as something to be *received* as the gift of divine grace, and not duty as something to be *done* in conscious service of God. Thus the attitude of man to God was wholly different under Pharisaism from what it was and is under

Christianity; the appeal of religion was to a different side of human nature, in the two cases respectively: mainly to the active side in the one and mainly to the passive side in the other. And this is true, even though it be also true that faith demands an effort of will, in turning to Christ and, so to speak, casting oneself on him. After all, that is only one great act in a spiritual crisis, and is very different from the consecration of all the acts of life to the service of God.

Faith in Christ, then, was the *sine qua non* of Christianity from the beginning. And faith in Christ meant not merely, and perhaps hardly at all, personal devotion to him as one who was the holiest and best of men; it meant faith in him as having saved sinners, paid the penalty of human sin, made atonement, satisfied the justice of God, overcome the power of evil, etc. Christ was regarded as the agent in a mysterious transaction whereby a divine purpose of redeeming love was carried into effect. In his own person Christ was held to have offered some kind of a sacrifice, the benefits of which were, indeed, open to all mankind, but could only be secured by faith in Christ who had so died for all.

Something like that was the fundamental idea of Christianity at its beginning, and has remained so to the present day, at all events for the great majority of Christians. That it is a perfectly valid form of religion is shown by the fact that it is held and has been held by so great a number of adherents, and, with all its defects, has produced such great and splendid results of life and character. I have not the slightest intention of offering any opinion as to the relative merits of Christianity and Judaism. That is a wholly irrelevant question. What I am trying to make clear, and to lay the greatest stress upon, is that the two religions are fundamentally different, wholly incommensurable, and incapable of being assimilated the one to the other. That was true even at the outset, when the founder of Christianity and his immediate followers were all Jews by birth and breeding, and considered themselves to be still Jews to the end of their lives. The incompatibility of the two religions became more apparent as Christianity proceeded on its way, created the Church, developed the Creeds and the whole mass of speculative theology, and built up the entire organisation of doctrine and ritual, faith

and practice, which goes under the Christian name.

The two religions no doubt rested in the last resort upon the same spiritual realities apprehended in the inward vision of the soul. (*See* Essay by the present writer in Hibbert Journal, Jan., 1923.) But in the one case these were stated in terms of Torah and interpreted along the lines of conscious doing of the divine will. In the other they were stated in terms of Christ and interpreted along the lines of faith in him and the desire of salvation. From premises so different the conclusions drawn were necessarily different; and the emphasis laid upon factors which were common to both was also different. Judaism included faith, but faith did not take the first place. That was claimed for right doing. Christianity included right doing, but right doing did not take the first place; that was given to faith. Judaism bade its adherents serve God before everything else. Christianity enjoined on its adherents faith in Christ before everything else. And this highly significant result followed, that as Judaism under the guidance of the Pharisees produced the Halachah,

so the Christian Church produced the Creed. In each case the liberty of the individual is restrained in regard to that which is regarded as the first essential of religion.

The Halachah was the definition, by competent authority, of what ought to be *done*; the Creed was the definition, by competent authority, of what ought to be *believed*. Thus the Halachah in the one case, and the Creed in the other, served as the condition of membership in the community, and as a bond holding the community together. If it is doubtful whether the Jewish community could have been kept together without the Halachah, it is no less doubtful whether the members of the Church could have been kept together without the Creed—or *a* creed. And if Christians condemn the elaboration of the Halachah, its minute definition of trifling acts and what they consider its reduction of religion to a mass of formality, they should remember that the speculative theology developed out of the Creed is open to precisely the same criticism. It is a case in which the retort is, "Physician, heal thyself."

We have now got the two religions before

our mind, with sufficient clearness, I hope, to be able to see the fundamental idea at the heart of each and to recognise that the two fundamental ideas are of a different order and cannot be made to harmonise. Such they might have been if they had never had anything to do with each other. But, historically, they have had a very great deal to do with each other. Judaism was the older, and Christianity was in some sense its offspring. The two have existed side by side ever since. What is the meaning of that fact? What is the significance of Judaism in general, and of Pharisaism in particular, in the religious development of mankind so far as that is represented by the presence of Christianity in the world? What is the function of Judaism as a religion co-present with Christianity while independent of it, and incapable of assimilation with it?

It is to the answering of this question, or at least the attempt to answer it, that I have been leading up in what I have said hitherto.

That Pharisaism had a significance as an element in the religious development of mankind is not denied by anyone. For if Judaism

were the preparation for Christianity, as is usually assumed, and even if it were nothing more, then that preparation depended largely, though not wholly, upon Pharisaism. It is true that Christianity rejected what was especially distinctive of the Pharisees, *viz.* the Halachah, and expressed its disapproval of them and their ways in terms of remarkable severity—as may be read in the Gospels and in the Epistles of Paul. So far as direct and immediate influence was concerned, Christianity owed more to the apocalyptic type of Judaism than it did to the Pharisaic type. Which is the very natural reason why so much stress is laid by Christian scholars at the present time upon the importance of the apocalyptic literature. But indirectly the debt of Christianity to Pharisaism was enormous. Thus, the Pharisees developed the Synagogue, as an institution whereby religion was fostered on the lines of personal piety, without priest and without ritual. And beyond any question Christianity owed a great deal to the Synagogue, from which it derived not merely the form but the very idea of congregational worship. And Christian missionaries found in the Synagogue of the places to which they jour-

neyed the natural starting-point for their own labours, in fields already in some degree prepared for them.

Again, it was the Pharisees, or more particularly the Scribes, of the older time, who had collected and arranged the Hebrew Scriptures. Without those Scriptures, which the Church appropriated to her own use, never even saying "By your leave," and denying that Jews had thenceforth any right to them—without those Scriptures Christianity would have lacked its chief means of proving to the Gentiles the truth of its message. Further, the general ethical teaching taken over in Christianity was substantially that of the Pharisees, though not exclusively so.

The Judaism out of which Christianity arose was by no means entirely Pharisaic; and, no doubt, Christianity was influenced by all the various types of Judaism then existing—unless perhaps that of the Sadducees. Nevertheless, the Pharisaic type was the one which had most of vitality and strength, most of self-supporting power, and could therefore exercise the strongest influence upon Christianity, directly or indirectly. It was a living Judaism which

gave birth to Christianity, and its life was most vigorous in Pharisaism.

Now, if the significance of Pharisaism were really confined to its having enabled Judaism to prepare the way for Christianity, it would necessarily follow that when Christianity had appeared, Pharisaism would disappear, or at least lose its vitality and worth as a religion. That this was really the case is indeed the usual opinion held by Christians; and, from the Christian point of view, it is a very natural opinion. It is taught in the New Testament quite definitely. Paul raised his whole theory upon a conception of the person and work of Christ which carried with it the corollary that the work of Judaism was done, the Torah had been the schoolmaster to bring men to Christ, and he had superseded it. Paul, indeed, as a former adherent to the religion of Torah, knew better than his Gentile brethren the formidable difficulties presented to his theory by the actual facts of the case. He did not by any means succeed in overcoming those difficulties; and his theory, so far as it concerned Judaism, rested upon sheer distortion of the facts. But even he could not forget what he had felt and

believed about the religion which had once been his and the people to whom he had once belonged. So he tried to make out some sort of a case to explain the continued existence of Judaism, and declared (Rom. xi., 25) that a hardening in part had befallen Israel, which would last until the fulness of the Gentiles had come in. In other words, the Jews would remain in their blindness and ignorance until the Gentile world had been saved; when that had been accomplished, then, presumably, the Jews would no longer harden their hearts against the truth thus clearly demonstrated. That was Paul's idea; but the Church would have none of it. Instead, it took the line that the day of Judaism was definitely over, and its inheritance taken from it and given to another; that Christ had annulled the Law, and those who still clung to it were clinging to a mere phantom. The Jews had rejected Christ and there was no more to be said; the loss of their Temple and the subsequent ruin of their land were the evident signs that God had done with them and thrown them over. Henceforth, if they existed at all, it was only to serve as an example and a warning, and negatively as a

witness to the truth of the Christian Gospel.

This theory, from the Christian point of view conclusive and satisfactory, is clearly shown to be wrong by the undeniable fact that Judaism, and more particularly Pharisaism, did not die out either then or since. And what is more, the rise of Christianity did not injure the vitality of Judaism, or impair its truth, or weaken its vitality in the eyes of its own adherents. They endured terrible sufferings in the two great wars,* and the Terror which followed the last one; but their spirit was not broken, nor were they under any misgiving as to the validity of their religion, that religion which had made them able to stand fast in the evil day. Such misgiving did, no doubt, find utterance in some of the apocalyptic writings, especially iv Ezra, but it did not express the real mind of Pharisaism. The proof of this is the fact that, as soon as the persecution was over, in 138 C.E., the Rabbis took up their old task of maintaining and guiding the religious life of the people, with unabated confidence in that task and trust in God Who had appointed it for

* These were against Vespasian 66–70 C.E. and against Hadrian 132–135 C.E.

them, even though He had so sorely chastened them.

From that time onward the Jews have been for the most part a people with a burden of sorrowful remembrance, but they have been also a people of undying hope and unconquerable faith. Such they have continued to be, down to the present day, in spite of all that Christians could do to convert them, to crush them, or to ignore them. Throughout the whole course of Christian history the Jews have been present side by side with Christians, looked upon as unwelcome intruders on the scene, the obstinate factor which resisted all attempts to bring it into the Church's scheme of unity, the stubborn dissenters from her teaching, the persistent witnesses that there was another side to what she would fain regard, and have the world regard, as a " chose jugée." They lived on in spite of all that Christianity could do or say. And they lived on because their religion was to them as true, as real, as divinely taught, as it had ever been. Neither Christ nor Paul, nor anybody else, had cancelled or destroyed it, whatever Christians might say. And so it has remained.

Evidently, therefore, the usual view that the significance of Judaism consisted in its having prepared the way for Christianity, so that its work was done when Christ had died, cannot be accepted, at all events not as usually understood. It is only a deduction from Christian premises, and the facts are all against it. Judaism, Rabbinical Judaism, is as deeply rooted in the hearts and souls of its adherents as Christianity in those of Christians. That is the only impartial test which can be applied. Mere assertion on the part of one against the other can carry no weight. The Christian denial of the validity of Judaism and of its right to continued existence rests only on Christian assumptions, and, as an absolute judgment, is worthless. Jews have never denied, nor wished to deny, the validity of the Christian religion; they have always recognised that it has been a powerful means of bringing the knowledge of God to the Gentile world.

Yet the view that Judaism was the preparation for Christianity is capable of another interpretation and a truer one than that which I have just put aside. That view is wrong in so far as it implies that the function of Judaism ceased

when Christianity appeared. It is not wrong so far as it implies that the pre-Christian development of Judaism had a meaning in reference to Christianity.

It is possible to take a wider view, which shall include Judaism both before and contemporary with Christianity, and also the Christianity with which it was thus associated, a view which shall show both Judaism and Christianity as parts in one great whole, one vast design, each having there a necessary place and function, and neither being the rival of the other nor superseding the other. Of this wider view, which I shall try to set forth, part is reconcilable with the usual conception of the relation of Judaism to Christianity; the rest is not.

It is generally admitted that Christianity, from the time it began to make its way in the world, took up and assimilated many ideas and usages of Gentile and particularly Greek origin. To what extent it was influenced by the mystery religions is uncertain. But the fact that Christianity was presented as a scheme of salvation through faith in a saviour who had died, points to some such influence, for such a conception certainly was not due to Judaism.

If anything like it were present in the mind of Jesus himself, then it was original to him and not part of his Jewish mentality.

Christianity very rapidly developed sacrificial and sacerdotal ideas, especially in the interpretation of the meaning of the death of Christ; and the Mass as a sacred mystery became the central feature of the ritual of the Church. No doubt these ideas were developed by means of passages taken from the Old Testament, and to that extent were indirectly the result of Jewish influence; but they would never have been developed at all unless they had met the requirements of Gentiles and harmonised with their previous usage. They had been accustomed to priests and sacrifices in their old religion, and very naturally looked for something of the same kind in the new religion. They did not learn it from Judaism; for the Judaism which had given birth to Christianity regarded priesthood and sacrifice as restricted to the Temple, while it lasted, and as having no place or function in the religion of the common life. Rabbinical Judaism was not then, and never has been, a priestly and sacrificial religion. The development of the sacerdotal and sacramental side of Christianity

only tended to make wider the difference between the two religions.

The doctrinal theology of the Church was almost entirely shaped by applying Greek, and afterwards Latin, thought to the original concepts. After the first generation, none of the leading Christian teachers were Jews; and they naturally kept their Greek, or other, ways of thought in working out the theology of the Church.

Much also in the common use and practice of Christians, in the early ages, was what had been the common use and practice of Gentiles before their conversion, and was merely taken over and, so to speak, sprinkled with holy water. The greatest instance of this is the transition by which the Pope gradually stepped into the place of the Roman Emperor.

In these various ways, Christianity adapted itself to what it found in the Gentile world and gained acceptance there. The rapidity with which it expanded, and the completeness of its final triumph over Paganism, show how well it fitted itself for its great task, though, indeed, its success was in some measure due to the extent to which it became Pagan itself. Still, it did

triumph over Paganism, and put in place of it a religion which contained the possibility of infinite spiritual progress, though not without grave defects. Christianity did, and has done ever since, an immense work in the religious development of mankind; and one has only to ask the question, Would it have been better if the Gentile world had been left without the missionary enthusiasm of Christianity? to be ready with the answer. Jews, who have had no reason to love the Church militant, have always owned that in bringing light and truth into the darkness and ignorance of the Gentile world, it has done a great work for God.

It was a necessary part of the function of the missionaries of the Church that they should take the Gospel right out into the Gentile world, preach it there and defend it there, expose it to all the risks of adverse influence which might corrupt its purity or confuse its thought. They went forth relying on the inherent power of the Gospel to maintain itself and prevail over such evil influences, being under no delusion as to the character of the Gentile world which they sought to redeem.

Now it is evident that this was an extremely

dangerous operation. I do not mean personally dangerous to the missionaries, though it was that. I mean dangerous to the Gospel itself as the divinely appointed instrument for raising and purifying the religious and moral condition of mankind. The danger came from the contact with and possible corruption by a religion and morality of a lower order than itself. The danger was a very real one, and by no means entirely without effect. Christianity boldly assimilated much that it found in Gentile thought and practice; but it also refused much and condemned much. It abandoned or modified some of its original conceptions, but it never wholly disowned its Jewish origin in fact, whatever it might do in theory. It began as a spiritual monotheism, and it has never quite lost that character, although it has introduced qualifications into its idea of monotheism for which Judaism is not responsible. Moreover, Christianity took over as its sacred book the Jewish Scriptures, and those Scriptures remained as the word of God in Christian acceptance, though they were interpreted in a Christian sense, and their teaching applied in non-Jewish ways. The Church never dreamed

of repudiating the Jewish Scriptures, and however much might be taken up of Gentile contributions to Christian belief and practice, it never sufficed to overcome the regulating and restraining influence which they exerted. If that restraining and regulating influence had been absent, if the Church cut herself loose from Judaism as completely as she wished to do and thought she had done, then it is conceivable that Christianity would have been completely amalgamated with the religions of the Gentile world. In that case, it would have stood on a much lower level in the scale of absolute religion than it does now, and would hardly have been able to claim the rank of a world religion. Apart from the original creative impulse, which was neither Jewish nor Gentile, but personal to the founder, it cannot be denied that the Jewish inheritance which the Church took over has been of immense importance in guarding Christianity from the peril of its immersion in the Gentile world.

All this is admissible on the usual theory that Judaism was a preparation for Christianity. The Jewish Scriptures were part of that preparation. I go on to a further stage of the

argument which is not compatible with the usual view, but which I believe to come much nearer to the truth. I remind you of what has been said about the fundamental difference between the two religions, whereby they are incommensurable with each other, cannot be harmonised and cannot be blended. Judaism in general, and Pharisaism in particular, was a religion which put the doing of God's will in the first place, and faith in the second place. Christianity reversed this order. Judaism all turned upon Torah; Christianity all turned upon Christ. In each case the standard of reference was different, the axioms and premises were different, the conclusions reached were different. Neither religion could by any possibility be transmuted into the other, or be rightly regarded as the development or the completion of the other. Each had its own right of existence, as each has its own truth to proclaim.

If we consider the two religions with a view to the uplifting and purifying of the Gentile world, being such as it was when Christianity appeared, then it can hardly be denied that a religion with the peculiar adaptive power of

Christianity was better fitted than Judaism to *begin* the work. Judaism neither did nor could go the lengths to which Christianity went in becoming all things to all men. And this is shown by the fact that, although Jewish influence had made itself felt in quiet ways amongst Gentiles before Christianity appeared, it never spread and caught on as rapidly as Christianity did. Presumably that was why Christianity appeared in the world at all when it did, and why it developed on the lines which it actually followed. And as I read this fact, it does not mean that Judaism was superseded and its work done when Christianity took the field. It means something quite different. It means that the design of uplifting the Gentile world, the providential training of the human race in religion and morality, needed *both* these religions and not one only; both present and active at the same time, not one superseding the other. This contention is not met by the usual answer that Christianity adopted the best in the Jewish religion and combined it with the best in the Gentile religion, becoming thereby the one supreme world religion. My point is that, although Christianity

had taken what it did from both these religions and had become thereby what it is seen to be in history, Judaism was still needed as its correlative term, because Judaism contained elements of permanent religious value which were not represented in Christianity, and which were incompatible with it. Whatever part Christianity was intended to play in the providential design for mankind, that part could only be played if there were present also, and at every stage, a living Judaism, partly to guard Christianity from being completely absorbed in Paganism, and partly to maintain and represent aspects of revelation other than those which Christianity offered. If Judaism had died out, or yielded to Christianity, then, obviously, the whole effect of its presence in the world would have been lost. But Christianity also, in that case, would have been rendered unable to do the work appointed for it,—if its appearance in the world has any reference to the divine plan. Christian efforts to convert the Jews, or to destroy Judaism, were in reality attempts at suicide; she was threatening her own life, since she was trying to suppress a form of religion

other than her own and equally necessary with her own, if her special task were to be fulfilled. The Church has always regarded a living Judaism as a continual danger. A dead Judaism would have been to her a fatal disaster.

Still speaking in terms of the divine plan, I would say that Judaism and Christianity were both necessary for the work of raising and purifying the religious and moral condition of humanity, Christianity as the immediate agent in the work and Judaism for its later stages, and till then for the safeguarding of Christianity against the danger of its task. Judaism waited, and still waits, not because of any "hardening in part" which has befallen, according to the mischievous phrase of Paul, but because the best she has to give will only then find acceptance when the preparatory work of Christianity has been done, and the world is ready for a religion which will unite the imperishable elements of both.

This is what I mean by the larger unity in which both Judaism and Christianity have each their necessary place and their appointed task.

Now will be seen the real meaning of the fact,

on which I have laid so much stress, that Rabbinical Judaism and Christianity are fundamentally irreconcilable. The fulfilment of the divine plan for the religious and moral training of mankind required the presence and influence of *two* types of religion, not of one only. The plan would have failed if the one religion could have been superseded or suppressed by the other. Therefore the two had to be mutually incommensurable, though not necessarily hostile. The hostility arose only through human inability on either side to read the deeper meaning of the relation between the two contrasted opposites. But it was surely no accident which produced these two types of religion, of which neither could be changed into the other, and neither could convert or destroy the other. Both were necessary, and both in due time appeared in the world.

Judaism was long anterior to Christianity; and Pharisaism had been in existence, in principle if not in name, for several centuries before Christianity arose. In the course of those centuries Judaism, under the influence of the Pharisees, was being moulded into the form which would make it best able to discharge the

function appointed for it in the divine plan. It was developed into a religion which would be able to maintain its vitality and individual character when it should be called on to meet the difficulties and dangers of co-existence with Christianity. Pharisaism, therefore, developed to the fullest extent the principle of devotion to the divine will, and took the Torah as its supreme revelation. The Pharisees were the forerunners of the Rabbis; and it was the Rabbis, contemporary with Christianity through the centuries, who had to meet the difficulties and dangers arising from the co-existence of the two religions. Theirs was the supremely hard task of keeping Judaism a living religion, true to its own vision of divine reality, in spite of all the efforts of a scornful or hostile world and a persecuting Church. Their defence against being borne down in the struggle was partly in the fact itself that their religion *was* fundamentally different from Christianity. The younger religion had nothing to offer them better or truer than what they already had in their own religion. From a worldly point of view, Jews had everything to gain from accepting Christianity. From the

religious point of view they had nothing whatever to gain. It was so even in the early days of the Church; and as the centuries went by, and the Church went further and further along the path of "being all things to all men," there was less and less which could induce a Jew to prefer the Christian religion to his own.

But the defence of Judaism against the disintegrating influence of Christianity was not only in the inherent difference in its character as a religion. The whole system of the Halachah acted both as a bond to keep the Jewish community together, and also as an external protective covering within which the spirit of Judaism could maintain its strength and vitality. Without the Halachah, it is hardly conceivable that Judaism should have survived through all the strain and stress of persecution which filled the centuries of its history in Christian times. The Halachah was thus an indispensable part of the equipment of Judaism for its world-function, the "armour of God, whereby it should be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all to stand." That has certainly been its effect.

Now, the Halachah was the peculiar creation

of the Pharisees. They laid down the principles on which it was based; and while it is perfectly true that the actual amount of defined Halachah recorded in the Mishnah and the Talmud is far greater than was in existence in the time of Jesus, yet there is no difference of principle between them. The Rabbis worked out more fully what the Pharisees had begun. What they both did was to build up a strong wall of protection within which Judaism might be safe, fearing no danger that might threaten it from any quarter. That they were conscious of the full meaning of what they were doing, I do not maintain. They had their own conception of religion and they developed it consistently and faithfully. But, looking back, we can plainly see that deeper meaning; and it is that, by the creation and elaboration of the Halachah, Judaism was being made ready for the hard and dangerous task which was awaiting it in the future. That I believe to be the real meaning of what is commonly described as the degradation of Judaism at the hands of the Pharisees, its reduction to a barren formalism, the descent from prophetic freedom to organised hypocrisy; so that Christianity arose as the liv-

ing from the dead, leaving Judaism a shrivelled corpse. A more profound misreading of history than that usually put forward it is hardly possible to imagine. Pharisaism was the application to life of the prophetic teaching. And such the Pharisees understood it to be. But beyond what they consciously understood was the deeper meaning of their work in the making ready of their religion, and the people who held it, to endure their age-long martyrdom in the coming time. They had their faults—who has not? Their system was not perfect; they themselves knew well the moral and spiritual dangers to which its adherents were exposed, and they were not always successful in averting those dangers. But they did their work in their day, in spite of the sneers and ill-will of the Gentiles. The Rabbis continued what the Pharisees had begun, and, through the labours of both, Judaism was carried safely through the ages, still fulfilling, at a terrible cost of sorrow and suffering, the task which God has given it to do.

What form that task will assume in ages yet to come, it is vain to speculate. But when the time shall come when Christianity shall have

done all it can do under the forms and conditions it has hitherto adopted, there will be then a Judaism able and ready to offer its imperishable treasure, kept safe through the ages, to a world which will no longer scorn. And at last the two great religions which will each have accomplished that for the sake of which God made them two and not one, will join in His service, and side by side utter the prayers and praises and inspire the lives of His children.

To have begun the preparation for that far-off divine event, is the true significance of Pharisaism.

LECTURE V

JOSEPHUS

BY

H. St JOHN THACKERAY, M.A., D.D.

JOSEPHUS

By H. St. John Thackeray

(A) His Life

The life of the historian is divided by the Great War of his time into two nearly equal portions: thirty-three stormy years spent in Palestine by the priest, patriot, general and prisoner, Joseph ben Matthias, and a period of comparative calm passed by the Roman citizen and man of letters, Flavius Josephus, in the capital of the Empire. Son of a priest and with royal blood in his veins on his mother's side, he was born in the year of the accession of Caligula, 37-38 C.E. Pontius Pilate had been recalled from Judea in the previous year; Herod Agrippa had just received his liberty and kingdom from the new Emperor. Of his education he tells us that he showed such precocity that Rabbis flocked to hear his wisdom at the age of 14; that at 16 he entered on what may be called his university career, when

he studied the tenets of the three national sects, Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes; how he followed this up by 3 years of ascetic life with a hermit, and how, on returning to Jerusalem, at the age of 19, he threw in his lot with the popular and influential party of the Pharisees. Of his early manhood one outstanding event is recorded—his visit to Rome at the age of 26 or 27 in the year 64. It was the year of the burning of Rome and the persecution of the Christians; but whether those events had occurred already is unknown. The ostensible object of his visit was to plead the cause of certain priests who had been sent up by Felix for trial. In this object he was successful, through the influence of the infamous Poppæa,* and returned to Judæa laden with presents from his Imperial patroness.

Whether this visit to the capital had any ulterior motive it is idle to conjecture. It impressed him, at any rate, with a sense of Rome's invincible power; and on his return to Judea where he found his countrymen smarting under the last of the procurators and heading for revolt, he vainly endeavoured to pacify the war

* Apparently a Jewish proselyte (*Ant.* xx, 195, θεοσεβής).

party. The turbulent state of the country soon brought Cestius Gallus, the Governor of Syria, upon the scene. His unaccountable withdrawal from the gates of Jerusalem was followed by the disastrous rout of a Roman legion in the defiles of Bethhoron in the autumn of 66. The irrevocable step had now been taken and hasty preparations were made for the impending war.

The young priest of 29, with two others (on what qualifications does not appear), was entrusted with an important commission in Galilee, if not the actual command of the district. The opening scenes of the Galilæan campaign in 66-67 are difficult to follow, and the policy and aims both of Josephus and of the Jerusalem leaders are far from clear. We have two accounts of this period, partly inconsistent and both biassed. In the *Life* we have Josephus' defence against a rival Jewish historian who accused him and the Galilæans of being responsible for the revolt;* in the *Jewish War* we have the story as written under Roman patronage. In the *War* Josephus is represented as being appointed general of Galilee and the

* *Vita*, 340.

surrounding district from the first;* in the *Life* we are merely told that his commission was to induce the hotheads† to lay down their arms. In a recent suggestive but rather fanciful work,‡ Herr Laqueur, who regards the *Life* as in the main the older work, lays stress on this difference and supposes that Josephus acted *ultra vires* in assuming the supreme command of Galilee and that this was the reason for the attempt of John Gischala to get him superseded. However that may be, he was suspected of harbouring designs of betraying the country to Rome. He may have hoped to avert war by some form of compromise, but events moved fast and forced him to put himself at the head of the war party. With the advance of Vespasian from Antioch, he finally resolved to stand a siege in the fortified town of Jotapata. Of the 47 days' siege (his brief military fame when he poses as a sort of defender of Mafeking), the fall of the town (July, 67), the capture of the Jewish general after a narrow escape, through a ruse, from death at the hands of his companions in hiding, and his prophecy of Ves-

* *Bell. Jud.* ii., 568.

† *Vita*, 29 (τοὺς πονηρούς); *cf.* 77 (τῶν λῃστῶν).

‡ *Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus.* R. Laqueur, Giessen, 1920.

pasian's rise to Imperial power—of all this he has left a graphic account.

Henceforth, in Roman hands, he was practically out of danger. Military operations were delayed by the events of the fateful year 68-69, which saw the death of Nero and, in rapid succession, the promotion of three Emperors. In July 69 Vespasian's legions took the law into their own hands and proclaimed him Emperor. One of his first acts in that capacity was the liberation of Josephus whose prediction had now come true. Accompanying the Emperor to Alexandria, Josephus returned from there with Titus to the siege of Jerusalem. Here his services as interpreter and mediator were in constant requisition. He was now, he tells us, between two fires; bitterly hated by the Jews and suspected of treachery by the Romans whenever they met with a reverse.

Of his life in Rome, after the fall of Jerusalem, and the various privileges bestowed on him by the Flavian Emperors, he gives us a brief sketch. Awarded the rights of Roman citizenship and a lodging in the mansion once occupied by Vespasian, he was among the first to be placed on the "civil list" instituted by that

Emperor.* He was still dogged by Jewish hatred, but with unfailing tact succeeded in retaining Imperial favour, even that of Domitian, and defeating his foes. He survived into the second century, outliving Agrippa II. who died in 100 C.E. From Eusebius† we learn that his statue was erected in Rome and his works placed in the public library.

Egoist as he was, it is not surprising that, in his domestic life he met with matrimonial troubles. He was married four times, being deserted by one wife and divorcing another.

(B) His Works

During the leisure of his life in Rome Josephus produced the four works which have come down to us.

(i) The "War": (a) The lost Aramaic.

He apparently at once took in hand a History of the War just ended. The first draft was written in his vernacular tongue (Aramaic) and sent to the inhabitants of Upper (or inland) Syria.‡ This edition is lost; but two conjec-

* "Primus e fisco Latinis Graecisque rhetoribus annua centena constituit," Suet., *Vesp.* 18.

† *Historia Ecclesiastica* iii., 9.

‡ "The Upper Barbarians," *B.J.*, i., 3.

tures may be hazarded about it. It was probably shorter than its Greek successor; its readers would not need the inordinately long historical introduction which fills nearly two books in the Greek and carries the narrative back to Antiochus Epiphanes, more than two centuries before the war. Again, written as it was from the former palace of Vespasian by his pensioner, there is much probability in the suggestion* that it was officially "inspired." It was a manifesto, intended as a warning to the East of the futility of further opposition. The danger of a Parthian rising was a constant menace.

(b) The Greek Edition.

However that may be, the Greek edition which has come down to us was unquestionably produced under imperial patronage. Though the author describes this as a "translation" of the earlier work,† a remarkable fact about it is the purity of the Greek and the entire absence of any sign of its Semitic parentage. A casual remark in a later work helps to explain this, where he acknowledges that he "employed

* Laqueur, *op. cit.* 126, f.
† *B. J.*, i., 3. Ἑλλάδι γλώσσῃ μεταβαλών.

certain collaborateurs (συνεργοι) for the sake of the Greek style."* It seems probable that these assistants had a large share in it, and that the Greek edition practically amounted to a new work. It appeared in parts and was the subject of a long correspondence between Josephus and Herod Agrippa. Two specimens of Herod's rather illiterate epistles are quoted. "Send me the remaining volumes," he writes in one; and again "King Agrippa to dearest Josephus greeting. From what you have written you appear to need no instruction to enable us all to learn (everything from you) from the beginning. But when you meet me, I will myself inform you of many things which are not (generally) known."† The work appeared towards the end of Vespasian's reign (between 75 and 79 C.E.) and copies were at once presented to his imperial patrons, Titus giving it his *imprimatur*. "So anxious," writes the author, "was Titus that my volumes should be the sole authority from which the world should learn the facts that he affixed his own signature and gave orders for their publication."‡ The

* *Contra Apionem* i. 50.
† Or "of which you are ignorant," *Vita*, 365 f.
‡ =*ib.* 363.

same passage mentions Agrippa as another recipient of a presentation copy, but it appears elsewhere that he was treated like the rest of the learned world and asked to pay for his copy.* Josephus had an eye to business and acted, it seems, as his own bookseller.

As historian of the Jewish War Josephus comes before us with high credentials. Holding command in Galilee in the opening campaign and behind the Roman lines throughout the siege of Jerusalem, he had exceptional qualifications for the task. He made notes of proceedings in the Roman camp and deserters kept him informed of events within the city.† Beside his own notes and recollections, he had access to the imperial "Memoirs."‡ Of these "Memoirs"—presumably an official record in Latin based on the field-notes of Vespasian and Titus—the latest writer, Wilhelm Weber,§ believes that Josephus has made extensive use. Much of the narrative, e.g., a *locus classicus* on the organisation of the Roman army,‖ doubtless comes from this source; Weber perhaps goes too far in deriving from it even the

* *Ap.* i., 51 (ἐπίπρασκον). † *Ib.* 49. ‡ *Vita*, 358; *cf. Ap.* i., 56.
§ *Josephus und Vespasian*. Berlin, 1921. ‖ *B.J.* iii., 70 ff.

geographical sketches of Palestine. Rarely has war historian enjoyed such advantages. One may compare (it is to the credit of Josephus that he does not suggest the comparison) the position of a far greater man, the historian of the Peloponnesian War. Widely different as were the characters of the two, there were points of similarity in their careers. Like Josephus, Thucydides combined the functions of general and historian; like him he failed as a military commander,* and through his consequent exile was enabled to associate with the enemy and to view the war from the standpoint of both belligerents.† There, unfortunately, the resemblance ceases. Yet, with access to these first-hand sources, with the weighty authority both of his imperial patrons and of King Herod behind him, and with the further (possibly more questionable) advantage of good literary assistants, we cannot, I think, but accept the *general* trustworthiness of the narrative of Josephus.

Reservations must, of course, be made. The "Memoirs" themselves were written from the Roman standpoint; and we may be sure that

* *Thuc.* iv., 104 ff. † *Ib.* v., 26; *cf. B.J.* i., 3.

the historian added a further pro-Roman bias. His repeated references to the clemency of the Roman generals and his representation of them as saviours of an oppressed people are especially open to suspicion. His statement that Titus desired to spare the Temple conflicts with the assertion of a later historian (Sulpicius Severus)* that he sanctioned its destruction. Josephus may be right, but his partiality leaves us in doubt. In the narrative of the Galilæan campaign, of which the *Life* presents a slightly inconsistent account, Laqueur suspects the author of the *War* of deliberate misrepresentation of details, in order to ingratiate himself with his other patron, King Agrippa.

(ii) The Antiquities.

In any case, the *War*, produced in the prime of the author's life under these favourable conditions, is a fine book. Some sixteen years were to elapse before another, his biggest though not his best work, appeared. The death of Titus in 81 seriously affected the position of literary circles in Rome. His successor, Domitian, was no patron of literature. "Historical writing," it has been said,

* Chron. ii., 30.

"suffered most of all under his oppression. . . . The only course possible, without the risk of outlawry or the sacrifice of personal honour was the one followed during the whole of his reign by Juvenal, Tacitus and Pliny—namely silence."* Josephus, like the poet Martial, retained the imperial favour by servility, and towards the end of the reign (in 93-4) the *Antiquities* (ἡ Ἰουδαικὴ ἀρχαιολογία) saw the light. He had now found a new patron in a certain Epaphroditus, who is probably to be identified with a grammarian and possessor of a large library and a writer on Homer. To him Josephus dedicates all his further productions.

Of the genesis of his *opus magnum* the author gives us an interesting glimpse. He tells how, when engaged on the *War*, he contemplated prefixing to it a sketch of his nation's history; how he then realised that so vast a subject would require a work to itself; how, as time went on, he had misgivings about embarking on so large an undertaking in an alien tongue; and how it was only through the instiga-

* Teuffel, *Hist. of Roman Literature*, Engl. trans. (1892), ii. p. 109.

tion of his patron and others that it was eventually carried through. He had satisfied himself that there was a demand for such a work; that the Greek-speaking world displayed a considerable interest (doubtless accentuated by the events of the year 70) in his nation's history. The writer's aim was to follow and improve upon the example of " The Seventy " by translating and popularising the Hebrew Scriptures. A further object was to represent his maligned nation in the best light to Greek readers;* the apologetic nature of the work is evident.

Josephus spared himself no pains in equipping himself for his task. The interval since the publication of the *War* must have been employed not only in mastering his main authorities, but also in thoroughly familiarising himsel with Greek literature of all kinds. To this wide indebtedness to Hellenism I will revert later. The very title of his work, ἡ Ἰουδαικὴ ἀρχαιολογία, and its division into 20 books are doubtless borrowed from the great Roman

* " To break down, if possible, the wall of partition that had hitherto secluded the Hebrew race from the communion, and cut them off from the sympathies of mankind," R. Traill, *Jewish War of Fl. Josephus*, 1862, p. 7.

history of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, written a century earlier, ἡ Ῥωμαικὴ ἀρχαιολογία (also in 20 books). The work roughly divides into two halves, comprising the Biblical and the post-Biblical periods. For the former he mainly follows the Septuagint, which is supplemented and diversified by legends, both Palestinian and Alexandrian, and by occasional use of secular historians and documents (such as Berosus and the annals of Tyre). From the Captivity to Antiochus Epiphanes, besides the LXX (I Esdras, Esther and I Maccabees) he uses the Letter of Aristeas, some legends of Alexander the Great and occasionally Polybius. Here special Jewish authorities fail him and he relies largely on the two lost universal histories of Augustan writers, Strabo and Nicolas of Damascus. The marked disproportion and inequality in the work is due to his available sources, of which there is an obvious deficiency in some parts and abundance in others. For the history of the return from exile his information is unfortunately very meagre. Upon the reign of Herod the Great, having the work of his admirer Nicolas before him, he dilates at great length. With the accession of Archelaus

this source fails him; the narrative expanding again into greater fulness only when the reign of Agrippa I. is reached. From this point the events fell within his own life-time, and information was obtainable from his contemporary, King Agrippa II.; but he is still apparently dependent, in the main, on written sources not fully identified.

Granting such blemishes as arise from inequality of treatment, the apologetic nature of the work, inadequate discrimination in the use of his sources, and a tendency to enliven the narrative by untrustworthy legends and picturesque details, there remains no very serious charge against the writer of the *Antiquities*. The work is, on the whole, a skilful compilation, its value varying with that of the authorities consulted, while an occasional criticism, such as that passed on the eulogist of Herod the Great* shows that discrimination was not always absent.

The Two Minor Works.

Two minor works were issued by Josephus in old age—when upwards of 63—early in the second century under the Emperor Trajan: the

* *Antiq. Jud.* xiv., 9; xvi., 183 ff., *cf.* 150 ff.

Life and the so-called treatise *Against Apion*. The *Life* is brought down to the second century by the allusion* to the appearance of a rival history of the War after the death of Agrippa, which, according to Photius, occurred in 100 C.E. The *Contra Apionem* is in any case later than 94, the date of the *Antiquities*, to which reference is made; but, as the anonymous rival historian, here alluded to, is probably the same Justus who is named in the *Life*, it also no doubt belongs to the second century. The two works form a strange contrast; we see our author at his worst and at his best. Both are controversial, one being an apology *pro vita*, the other *pro gente sua*. But in style, arrangement and treatment they are so different that one would hardly regard them as contemporary productions from the same pen.

(iii) Vita.

The *Life* is an appendix to a later edition of the *Antiquities*. The larger work has two endings. In the first the author writes (§259): "Here I will end my *Archaeology*," and then, after some recapitulation and self-advertise-

* *Vita*, 359 f.

ment, he proceeds (266): "But perhaps it will not be taken amiss if I append a brief statement about my family and career while persons still survive either to refute or to corroborate what I say." Then comes the second conclusion, beginning (267) "But here I will close the *Archaeology*," and giving the precise date of writing "the 13th year of Domitian and the 56th year of his own age," that is 93-94 C.E. The *Life*, however, we know, did not appear until after 100. Clearly we have here two perorations, that of the second edition occupying the first place.

The event which occasioned the appendix was the publication of a rival history of the Jewish War by a compatriot, Justus of Tiberias, who accused Josephus of causing his native city (Tiberias) to revolt from Rome. The damaging criticisms of Justus were calculated to endanger, not only the sale of Josephus' works, but perhaps even his security at Rome. They called for an immediate rejoinder. The *Life*, then, by no means answers to its name; it is not a complete autobiography. The bulk of it is the author's defence of his conduct during the half-year of his command in Galilee be-

fore the siege of Jotapata. To this, brief sketches of his youth in Palestine and his later life in Rome have been added as prologue and epilogue. The work, in which the author indulges his vanity to the full, is, alike in subject-matter and in language, the least satisfactory of his writings. The weakness (as it appears to a civilian) of his boasted strategy is on a par with the crudity of his style.

A theory has recently been propounded which would go far to explain the latter—the crude style. Herr Laqueur maintains that the kernel of the *Vita* is not among the latest, but the very earliest work of our author, written at the age, not of 65, but of 30. It is, in his opinion, an official report of his conduct of affairs in Galilee, drafted, before the siege of Jotapata, for submission to the authorities at Jerusalem. It is his defence against the charge which had been made against him of aiming at a *τυραννίς*. This theory is based on a comparison of the parallel accounts in the *Life* and in the *War* in the few passages where they overlap. Laqueur seeks to prove that the *Life* is the older and more trustworthy of the two, and that the narrative in the *War*

has been modified out of deference to Agrippa. This unliterary report, of which no use was made at the time, was in after-life unearthed to meet the attack of Justus and, with a little revision, worked up into an autobiography. It is an attractive theory. That Josephus should have kept some contemporary record of that period appears probable. I am not, however, convinced that Laqueur has proved his thesis; in particular I note that the style of the *Life* as a whole has much in common with that of the last book of the *Antiquities*, a fact which rather conflicts with the earlier date suggested. If he is right, we have an interesting relic of our author's style of composition before he came under the influence of his literary friends in Rome. If the whole work is really late, the lack of literary finish must be due to hasty production and his being thrown upon his own unaided resources.

(iv) Contra Apionem.

As a set-off to the *Life*, the last treatise, the *Contra Apionem* in two books, is the most attractive of our author's works; exhibiting a well-designed plan, great literary skill, an intimate

acquaintance with Greek philosophy and poetry, together with a more sincere and impassioned zeal for his country's religion than we find elsewhere. The title (not the author's) is not very happily chosen. Apion is merely one representative of Israel's enemies.* It is designed as a reply to criticisms on the *Antiquities* and a refutation of current prejudices against the Jewish nation; as an apology for Judaism with a demonstration of the antiquity of the race. It gives an interesting insight into the anti-Semitism of the first century. The writer challenges the extreme antiquity claimed by the Greeks; accounts for their silence on Jewish history; cites an array of evidence (Egyptian, Phœnician, Babylonian and Greek) for the antiquity of his own nation; has no difficulty in rebutting the malignant and absurd fictions of the anti-Semites; and concludes with an eloquent defence of the lawgiver and his code, his lofty conception of God being contrasted with the immoral ideas current among the Greeks. Numerous quotations from lost writings give this work a special value.

* Older titles were " On the (extreme) antiquity of the Jews " (not sufficiently distinctive) and " Against the Greeks."

(v) Projected Works.

At the end of the *Antiquities** Josephus tells us of two further literary projects: (1) a summary sketch of the war and the after-history of his nation; (2) " a work in four books concerning God and His being, and concerning the Laws, why some things are permitted to us by them and others are forbidden." Neither work apparently was ever published. But that on " Customs and Causes," to use his short title for it, had, as we may infer from the mention of the four books and from scattered allusions in the *Antiquities* to its intended contents, taken shape in his mind and was probably begun. That he did not live to complete a task which would have thrown light on his relation to Palestinian and Alexandrian exegesis is a matter for regret.

I have now briefly outlined the life and works of Josephus; it remains to attempt some estimate of the relation in which he stood to his contemporaries and his importance for us. The world in which he moved comprised, besides his Roman patrons, three classes: his Jewish com-

* *Ant.* xx., 267 f. (the " first edition.")

patriots, the wider Greek-speaking community which he addressed, and the little body of Christians just emerging from obscurity. I propose in the rest of this lecture to make some observations on our author's relationship (1) to Hebraism, (2) to Hellenism and (3) to Christianity. On the first and last of these heads I speak with diffidence. I am conscious that my present audience are better qualified than I am to appraise our author's Hebraic affinities. His relation to Christianity—the question of the authenticity of one notorious passage—is a highly controversial subject, on which I have changed my mind and still have doubts. Such new material as I have to offer comes under the middle category, his relation to Hellenism.

(C) His Relation to Hebraism.

Language. With unusual modesty Josephus on one occasion* admits that he never succeeded in mastering the pronunciation of Greek. In venturing to estimate his relationship to Hebrew language and thought before this audience, I am conscious of a similar failing, a lack

* *Ant.* xx., 263.

of thorough grounding, not only in Hebrew pronunciation, but in Rabbinical lore.

Of his native tongue, Aramaic, in which he composed the first draft of his *Jewish War*, Josephus was presumably a master. Was his knowledge of Hebrew equally profound? It may seem impertinent to question the proficiency of a priest and writer of his education in the language of Scripture. Yet others better qualified to express an opinion* have concluded that he was "weak in his Hebrew," that his knowledge was only "superficial." The test to which he lays himself open is his translation of proper names. Many of these are correct enough; some were taken over from his Bible, whether Hebrew or Greek. But others are, to say the least, slipshod, or even inaccurate. Eve (Ἑύα) he says (*Ant.* i. 36) signifies (σημαίνει), "mother of all"; his Bible told him (Gen. iii. 20) that Adam called his wife's name *Hawwah* ("Living" or "Life") "because she was the mother of all"; but that is not what Josephus states. Again (*Ant.* iii. 252) he asserts that the feast which the

* *E.g.*, Ewald and Edersheim, *Ap.* Dict. of Christian Biog. iii., 452, f.

Hebrews call ἀσαρθά —note the *Aramaic* form of the Hebrew "*atzereth*"—means "fiftieth." If he had said "is called Pentecost by the Greeks," he would have been correct, but no etymology of the Semitic word can, I imagine, support this alleged numerical sense. On the year of Jubilee he states (*ib.* iii. 283) that the word ἰώβηλος signifies "freedom" (ἐλευθερία); this he apparently takes from the LXX (ἐνιαυτὸς ἀφέσεως); Jewish tradition gives what is probably the correct meaning—"ram" or "ram's horn." With this may be linked the explanation of Gilgal or Galgala (*ib.* v. 34), "this word means 'free' or 'liberal,' (ἐλευθέριον)"; the freedom in this case lies in the loose paraphrase of the correct Biblical explanation (Jos. v. 9), "This day have I *rolled away* the reproach of Egypt from off you. Wherefore the name of that place was called Gilgal." The interpretation of Samson (*ib.* v. 285), "the name means (ἀποσημαίνει) 'strong,'" is, in Professor Burney's opinion, "probably guess work"; the connexion with *shemesh* "sun," "may be considered certain." Even if these statements may be attributed to indolence rather

than ignorance (" That is good enough for my Greek readers "), Hebrew philology cannot be regarded as our author's *forte*.

Biblical Text. His proficiency in Hebrew would be put beyond doubt, could we trust his own statements. More than once he professes to have translated the Hebrew Scriptures himself. " This work," he writes (*Ant.* i. 5), " will embrace a complete account of our ancient history and constitution, translated from the Hebrew records "; again, more unequivocally (*ib.* x. 218), " At the outset of my work . . . I remarked that *I was merely translating the books of the Hebrews into Greek* and promised to repeat the story without any addition or omission on my own part."* There is more than one inaccuracy here. What was Josephus's Bible? For the most part, from Samuel onwards, his authority was not the Hebrew, but the LXX. He has availed himself of the labours of the Alexandrian translators. His own part is here limited to recasting in a rather more literary form the crudities of his original; but the underlying phrases of the Greek Bible are constantly apparent.

* *Cf. Ap.* i., 1.

This gives the measure of our historian's veracity and compels one to bring two indictments against him. With all his boasted zeal for the truth, he has a lax sense of what that word means. An inexactitude like this, which we can control, arouses suspicions in more important matters. Again (a more venial offence) he omits to acknowledge his debts to others. He has a curious and, I think, apposite comment on the prophecies of Balaam. He says (*Ant.* iv. 157f.) that Moses "highly honoured Balaam by recording" these; "and, though it was open to him to appropriate and take the reputation for them himself, as there would have been none to convict him, he gave him the credit and deemed it right to mention him." Similarly, he extols the magnanimity of Moses in not concealing the fact that the advice of Jethro did not originate with himself, "holding it right to give the credit to whom it was due, even though he might increase his own reputation by appropriating the invention of others" (*ib.* iii. 73f.). I hope I am not doing Josephus an injustice in regarding these comments as giving a rather sinister insight into his own mind. I shall have occasion to mention another

instance of his failure to imitate the lawgiver's candour.

I have carefully collated Josephus's Biblical text with both Hebrew and Greek, with the following results. The Octateuch stands apart from the rest. As I have said, from I Samuel onwards he uses the LXX, and follows it so closely that it is possible to identify the particular type of text before him. This type remains constant throughout not only the canonical books, but also such apocryphal books as I Esdras and I Maccabees. His nearest allies are always a small group of cursive MSS. known as "Lucianic." Lucian of Antioch was martyred early in the 4th century and his recension of the LXX appeared not till 200 years after Josephus's death; but it is known to have preserved much ancient material. Of this "proto-Lucianic" text, as we may call it, Josephus made use; and he earns our gratitude by transmitting some valuable information as to the Greek version, presumably current in Palestine in his day, although he has erroneously claimed it as his own.

With the earlier Biblical books the case is rather different. In the Pentateuch there is

some, but much slighter, use of the LXX, chiefly in the forms and explanations of proper names; but the main authority here cannot be identified with any known type of Greek text and was apparently Semitic. In Joshua, Judges and Ruth, apart from a few forms of proper names, I find no convincing trace of any use of the LXX. I would, however, hazard the conjecture that his primary authority here and his subsidiary authority elsewhere was not the Hebrew Bible, but some form of Aramaic Targum.* It would be interesting to know the nature of the "sacred books" which he was allowed by Titus to rescue from the ruins of Jerusalem.†

Tradition and Legend. Josephus's assertion‡ that he has neither added to nor omitted anything from the Biblical narrative is another of his misstatements, though we need not cavil at the numerous legendary additions which he has incorporated. They form an interesting collection of first-century *Midrash*. Many of them

* For agreement with the Targum in the books of Kings' see *Ant.* viii., 362 (γυμνοῖς τοῖς ποσί), ix., 117 (σχολαίτερον καὶ μετ' εὐταξίας); *cf. also* vi., 325 (εἰς Ῥεγγάν) with the note of Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus*, p. 32, and, perhaps, v, 283 (χωρὶς των ἀγγέλων).

† *Ant.* i., 17; x., 218. ‡ *Vita*, 418.

can be illustrated from the pre-Christian *Book of Jubilees*, one of the earliest works of this class; others find parallels in the Talmud. In common with *Jubilees*, *e.g.*, he tells us that the beasts in Paradise spoke with human tongue (*Ant.* i. 41: *Jub.* iii. 28); that Adam and Eve had daughters (*Ant.* i. 52: *J.* iv. 1, 8 for names); of the inscriptions on pillars made by the antediluvians to ensure the preservation of their discoveries (*Ant.* i. 70, cf. *J.* viii. 3); that the name of Pharaoh's daughter, the foster-mother of Moses, was Thermuthis (*Ant.* ii. 224: *J.* xlvii. 5, Tharmuth). The identification of persons, places and dates, and inferences deduced from a comparison of Biblical passages are characteristically Rabbinic. It was Nimrod, the city-builder, who designed the Tower of Babel (*Ant.* i. 113f.); Moses died on the first of the month of Adar (iv. 327); the name of the prophet who paralysed Jeroboam was Ἰάδων vii. 231); the anonymous prophet who foretold Ahab's death because he spared Benhadad was Micaiah (viii. 391) the man who drew a bow at a venture and slew him was Ἄμανος (viii. 414; Naaman); the woman who besought Elisha to save her from her creditors was the widow of

Obadiah who, in order to support the prophets in hiding, had had recourse to money-lenders (ix. 47). Rabbinic casuistry in reconciling prophecies seemingly inconsistent is illustrated by the stories of the two Zedekiahs, the son of Chenaanah and the King of Judah.* On Moses, both as infant prodigy and as leader of the campaign against the Ethiopians, our author's *Haggadah* is unusually rich. For such legends he has had access to Alexandrian as well as Palestinian sources; the discrimination between these two channels of information needs investigation.

(D) His Relation to Hellenism

Style. I pass on to consider the historian's relation to Hellenism. His works were written for educated Greek readers and he took extraordinary pains to acquire a good style. At the beginning of the fourteenth book of his *Antiquities* (2f.) he writes: "Among other qualifications the historian and reporter of events which, owing to their antiquity, are unfamiliar to most persons, needs charm of style, in so far as this is attainable by the choice and

* *Ant.* viii., 407 f. and x., 106 f.

combination of words and whatever else may serve to embellish the narrative for his readers, in order that the instruction may be attended by a certain fascination and pleasure; but, above all, he must aim at accuracy.''* Here he emphasises the importance of the choice of words and their '' nice adjustment '' (*ἁρμονία*); the avoidance of hiatus or harsh clashing of vowels is a marked feature of his style. At the time when he wrote, the usual fashion in literary circles was to revert (or to attempt a reversion) to the Attic of the age of Pericles and to stem the development of the language which had set in with the Alexandrian age. Josephus is a representative of this Atticistic revival. Not only must no trace of his native Aramaic sully his pages, but he must abjure the '' vulgarisms,'' as they were thought, employed by the Alexandrians and even by Polybius. His fastidiousness is apparent from the way in which, while using the LXX, he constantly replaces certain of the translators' words by others of a more literary character (*e.g.*, *ἐσθής* is used for *ἱμάτιον*, *πέμπειν* for *ἀποστέλλειν*, and the like). Similarly he has been at the

* *Cf. Ant.* xx., 263.

pains to reshape most of the sentences in the *Letter of Aristeas*.

Collaborators. He thus set himself an exacting task. Such knowledge of Greek as he may have acquired in Palestine cannot have been profound; and the question arises how much assistance he obtained from others in Rome. For the *Jewish War* we know, from a welcome *obiter dictum*, that he had such help. In the *Contra Apionem* (ii. 50) he makes the tardy acknowledgment that, in composing the Greek edition some 25 years earlier, he "employed collaborators (συνεργοί) for the sake of the Greek style." He makes no similar admission about the *Antiquities*, and it is commonly assumed that the composition is wholly his own. That assumption is, I believe, erroneous. I have studied Josephus's style with some care, and my previous experience in detecting *strata* in the LXX led me to hope that a similar quest in Josephus might not be fruitless. In the *War* I have not, so far, succeeded in distinguishing between the contributions of the various συνεργοί. That work is written in a uniformly excellent style and con-

tains a large vocabulary unrepresented in the *Antiquities*. The Greek is classical, without being a slavish imitation of classical authors. The *amanuenses*, I fancy, had a large share in the composition.

In the *Antiquities*, on the other hand, the style is much more uneven; and here I detect, if I am not mistaken, two large adjacent portions, comprising nearly five books in all, which are, in the main, the production of hands other than that of our author. These portions are Books xv—xvi. (which I shall call α) and xvii, xviii and xix, 1-275 (which I call β).

The peculiarities here are not attributable to Josephus's authorities. The authority for the reign of Herod in Ant. xvii. (Nicolas of Damascus) is not the same as the Roman source for the assassination of Caligula in *Ant.* xix; yet the same unmistakable style marks that whole section from beginning to end. Nor can they be referred to the author himself. Some variation in style might be intelligible if the work had been laid aside for a time; but a writer does not change his style two or three times over. The peculiarities of *Ant.* xvii-xix do

not persist to the end. At the close of xix and throughout xx there is a resumption of what may be called the more normal style, which continues into the Appendix (the *Life*), and it is in the *Life*, if anywhere, that we get the *ipsissima verba* of the author. I am, therefore, driven to the conclusion that this large portion of the *Antiquities* was entrusted to subordinates under the author's general supervision.

Assistant β.—I can but briefly touch on the details. I will take assistant β first (xvii-xix). The pecularities of this portion were noted by me in an Article which I wrote for Hastings' *Bible Dictionary* nearly 20 years ago.* The language throughout this group has well-marked characteristics, many of them traceable to Thucydides. Imitation of Thucydides, found sporadically elsewhere, here reaches its climax. The writer attempts to reproduce the involved style of his model, with the result that he is often obscure. Periphrasis is frequent; the writer prefers to use two or more words where one would

* G. Schmidt (*de Flav. Jos. elocutione*, 1893,) had remarked on them, but was content to refer them to Josephus's authority.

suffice. The simple verb is replaced by the agent with εἶναι, *e.g.* κριτὴς εἶναι for κρίνειν (xix, 217). Double negatives are common: μὴ ἀπηλλαγμένος "not incapable of" (after Thuc.), οὐ (or μὴ) ἀποτετραμμένος not averse to." "Quickly" is expressed (after one passage in Thucydides) by μηδὲν (οὐδὲν) εἰς ἀναβολάς, "with no delay," sometimes strengthened by ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ ὀξέος (seven words for one). The departure from the author's normal practice extends to the spelling: the double σ (of Thucydides) in words like πράσσειν replaces the so-called "Attic" double τ, usual elsewhere in Josephus. Among other features not derived from Thucydides are the use of ὅποσος for ὅσος (over 100 examples; a hall-mark of this literary hack), and of συνέρχεσθαι in the sense of "happen."

Throughout this portion no authority is named. The subject-matter is in part identical with that of Books i and ii of the *War*. In these parts we have merely a verbose paraphrase of the earlier narrative; there has been no recourse to the original authorities. The instructions to the amanuensis were: "Take the *War* as your authority, but be careful to vary the phraseo-

logy." Much important new matter was also included, largely drawn, it would seem, from Roman sources. Latin was certainly the original language of the detailed account of Caligula's death and the conspiracy which led to it,*—a valuable fragment of Roman history, but with little relevance to Jewish Antiquities.

Assistant α. The peculiarities of *Ant.* xvii-xix cannot fail to strike a careful reader. The special characteristics of the two preceding books (xv-xvi) are less obvious; and I should not have detected them had I not undertaken to compile, for my own purposes, a lexicon to Josephus. The frequent links between the vocabulary of these two books has convinced me that here we have another συνεργός at work. I need not now enumerate instances. Less distinctive than in the other group, it is their accumulation which is significant. I can but state general conclusions. Assistant "α" is a writer of some distinction, no mere hack or slavish imitator like "β." He seems to have been given greater latitude by Josephus. The two books are wholly occupied with Herod's reign, and the earlier narrative in

* *Ant.* xix (the bulk of the book).

the *War* has here been, not paraphrased, but wholly rearranged, with fresh recourse to the original authorities. This is the less surprising if, as I believe, the writer is to be identified with one of the assistants previously employed for the *War*.

These five books (xv-xix) cover a period of 78 years, from the beginning of Herod's reign (37 B.C.E.) to the accession of Claudius (41 C.E.). We may speculate on the reasons why Josephus, apparently, sought help at this point. No doubt, in the first place, weariness of his *magnum opus*; he tells us in his preface (i. 7) of "hesitation and delay." He was here, moreover, on ground already partially covered in the *War*; he was content to leave the reproduction of the narrative to others. But, beyond this, much of the new matter to be incorporated was in Latin, and, linguist though he was, our author's proficiency in Latin was probably slight. He needed a translator.

Use of Greek Literature. Whether prompted by his literary advisers or not, Josephus shows a surprising acquaintance with Greek literature. Not only did he consult the necessary pagan authorities, but he must have perused numer-

ous other volumes, both in prose and verse, in his patron's library or his own, to improve his style. It is one of the compensations for the tedious task of his translator that he sends him back to the great masters.

Thucydides. I spoke of his imitation of Thucydides. Though this culminates in *Ant.* xvii-xix, it is apparent in most parts of that work. Others before Josephus had quarried from this mine; the "Thucydideans" were already derided by Cicero.* The whole history of the Peloponnesian War is at his fingers' ends; but the retreat from Syracuse, the siege of Platæa, the plague, and the speeches of Pericles provide the most frequent reminiscences. The old Grecian battles are refought, one may almost say, on Palestinian soil. A long, though not exhaustive, list is given by Drüner. A few instances must suffice. In the account of the plague of Athens Thucydides speaks of the courageous visitors of the sick as "those who aspired to heroism" (*οἱ ἀρετῆς μεταποιούμενοι*, ii. 51); the phrase is repeated, with variations, by Josephus or his assistants more than half a dozen times (five

* *Orator*, 30 (quoted by Drüner, *Untersuchungen*, Note 1).

times in *A.* xvii, xviii alone). The plague also colours the description of Herod's last illness (Th. ii. 49: *A.* xvii. 168). The flight of Herod from the Parthians recalls the flight of the Athenian army from Syracuse (Th. vii. 76: *A.* xiv. 355); the contrast between the departure for Italy, amid universal acclamation, of Antipater, Herod's unfortunate heir, and his cold reception on his return recalls the older historian's contrast between the beginning and end of the Sicilian expedition (Th. vii. 75: *A.* xvii. 88). One instance must be quoted from an earlier book to show how our author, who professes to " add nothing " to the Biblical narrative, does not scruple to embellish even this with picturesque details from Thucydides. The besiegers of Platæa attempted to destroy the city by a huge bonfire. " A flame arose," writes Thucydides (ii. 77), " of which the like had never before been made by the hand of man "; and then with characteristic caution and an allusion to an ancient belief, he adds, " I am not speaking of fires in the mountains, when the woods have spontaneously blazed up from the action of the wind and mutual attrition." Josephus must better that; this is from his ac-

count of the burning of Korah and all his company: "Suddenly there blazed up a fire, the like of which had never in the records of history been made by the hand of man, nor was ever ejected from the earth through subterranean current of heat, nor yet spontaneously broke out in the woods from the violence of the wind and mutual attrition" (*A.* iv. 55).*

Next to Thucydides the largest use is made of Herodotus, Xenophon, Polybius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Demosthenes and the orators have also been studied.

Poets. More remarkable than this pilfering from prose writers are the reminiscences of the poets, Homer and the Tragedians. Not merely does he allude generally to the immoral ideas in Greek poetry about the gods, but many borrowed phrases show close familiarity with plays of Sophocles and Euripides. The domestic troubles of Herod's house are told in the manner of a Greek drama. The ghosts (δαίμονες) of the murdered sons roam the palace as inquisitors and informers and drag

* In one curious instance—an incident common to *B.J.* and *Ant.*—the historian in both books borrows from the same passage of Thucydides, but is careful not to repeat himself, using one phrase of his model in *B.J.* and another in *Ant.* (*Cf.* *B.J.* i, 178; *Ant.* xiv, 103, with Thuc. i, 128).

secrets to light (*B.J.* i. 599); the wretched father is pursued by a pack of furies (*A.* xvii. 3 τοιαίδε αὐτὸν περιέσπευδον ἀραί); we hear of the avengening deity (*B.J.* i. 596 (καθ' ᾅδου φέρειν τὸν ἀλάστορα) and the pollution of the house (μύσος τῆς οἰκίας, *ib.* 530,638).* Josephus is not the place where we should look for an allusion to a lost play of Euripides. Stobæus† has preserved a fragment of the *Ino* of that poet:—

" When blest by fortune slack not every rein;
When faring ill hold fast to kindly hope."
(κακῶς τε πράσσουσ' ἐλπίδος κεδνῆς ἔχου).

Of this there is a clear reminiscence when it is said of Aristobulus, after his defeat by Pompey, that " though faring ill he none the less held fast to good hope " (καὶ πράττων κακῶς οὐδὲν ἧττον ἐλπίδος ἀγαθῆς εἴχετο, *A.* xiv. 96; *cf.* viii. 214, ἀγαθῆς ἐλπίδος ἔχεσθαι).

It is plain that our author's mind was saturated with Greek phraseology and modes of thought. Further illustration of this might be found in his constant use of the impersonal τὸ θεῖον for " the Deity " and in his comparison

* *Cf. A.* xiii, 317 (the ψυχή owed to the δαίμονες of the dead).
† Dindorf, *Frag.* 407.

of the three sects of his nation (Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes) with the Greek schools of philosophy (Stoics, Epicureans and Pythagoreans). He is even not ashamed to use for the altar at Jerusalem the word for a heathen altar, scrupulously avoided by the Alexandrian translators (*βωμός*). So far was the Jewish priest sunk in Hellenism.

(E) His Relation to Christianity

Some reference must be made, in conclusion, to our author's attitude to Christianity and the authenticity of a famous passage in the *Antiquities*.

Christianity in Rome. Of the events of the life of Christ and of his followers Josephus had every opportunity of acquainting himself, if not in Palestine, at least in Rome; and his curiosity would doubtless lead him to investigate the facts. Twice within his life-time the Christians of the metropolis suffered persecution; on the second occasion certainly, possibly also on the first, Josephus was on the spot. Already on the former occasion the sect had gained a footing, if only in a menial capacity, in the imperial court. "They of Cæsar's household" send

special salutations by St. Paul to the Philippians.* Even then the Roman Church was no insignificant body. Josephus's early visit to Rome was paid shortly after this, in 64, the fateful year of the great fire and the first Christian persecution. He tells us only of his special commission and his visit may have preceded the outbreak; anyhow, no inference can be drawn from his silence, either favourable or the reverse, as to his attitude to Christianity.† But, on the second occasion, the meaning of Christianity and the risks incurred by its followers and eulogists must have been brought forcibly home to him. The new religion had now penetrated to the highest quarters in "Cæsar's household" and won converts in the near kinsmen of the Emperor, bearing the same "Flavian" name as the historian himself. In 95 C.E. (the year after the appearance of the first edition of the *Antiquities*) Domitian, in a fit of that savagery which marked the close of his life, put to death, among others, his first cousin

* Phil. iv. 22.

† Edersheim (*Dict. Christian Biogr.*) suggests, on the one hand, that he may have been instrumental in obtaining the liberation of St. Paul. Corrsen (*Z.N.T.W.* 1914, p. 139 f.), on the other, darkly hints that the presents showered on him by Poppæa were a reward for his malicious instigation which prompted the persecution. Both suggestions are, of course, purely imaginary.

Flavius Clemens (who had been consul in the previous year) and banished his niece, Flavia Domitilla, the wife of Clemens, for atheism (ἀθεότης) — the common charge brought against the early Christians—or, as Eusebius expressly says "for witness to Christ."*

When Josephus wrote, Christianity bulked much less largely in the world than it did half a century later. Yet it might have been said of him, as was said of his friend King Agrippa, that "none of these things was hidden from him; for this thing was not done in a corner."† He knew the facts, in part at least; what use did he make of his knowledge?

Allusions to John the Baptist and James. Now, whatever doubt may be felt about the allusion, which stands in his work, to the founder of Christianity, Josephus frankly mentions two persons most intimately connected with Him, the forerunner and James "the Lord's brother." The authenticity of these two passages is beyond question and their interest is considerable. In the first of them (*A.* xviii. 116-119) he describes the imprison-

* Merivale, *Rom. Emp.* vii, 152; Lightfoot, *Phil.* 22 and *Apostolic Fathers*, Part I, vol. i; Eusebius, *H.E.* iii, 18.
† Acts xxvi, 26.

ment and murder of "John surnamed the Baptist" by Herod the Tetrarch. The account differs from, but is not inconsistent with, the Gospel narrative, which it supplements rather than contradicts. Herod's execution of John is told in proximity to, though not directly connected with, the tetrarch's adultery with his brother's wife. According to Josephus, the adultery led to a war between Herod and his father-in-law Aretas, in which Herod's army was cut to pieces. "Some of the Jews," he proceeds, "regarded the destruction of Herod's army as an act of God, who thus exacted very just retribution for the murder of John." John is then characterised as "a good man," and we are told of his tenets on the efficacy of baptism and of his immense popularity and influence, which aroused Herod's apprehensions of an insurrection and led to his arrest and execution. The Greek bears the unmistakable marks of this portion of the *Antiquities*.* The hand is the hand of his secretary ("assistant β"); the voice that prompts it is that of Josephus.

* Note in particular: 116 τινυμένου; 117 συνιέναι (βαπτισμῳ), ἁμαρτάς; 118 ἀκρόασις, ἐπὶ τοσόνδε, φέρειν ἐπί τινι; 119 ταύτῃ ('here') κτίννυται.

In the second passage (*A.* xx. 200-203) we read how the newly appointed high-priest Ananus seized the opportunity of an interregnum in the office of procurator to put a rival to death after a perfunctory trial by the Sanhedrin. Ananus is characterised as "a rash and extraordinarily daring man, of the sect of the Sadducees, who, as previously stated, are more ruthless than all Jews in their judicial sentences." "He," the writer proceeds, "thinking that a favourable opportunity presented itself —Festus being dead and Albinus still on the road—summoned the court of the Sanhedrin, brought before it the brother of Jesus who was called Christ—James was his name—with some others, and, after accusing them of trangressing the law, delivered them over to be stoned to death. This action aroused the indignation of all citizens of the highest reputation for moderation and punctilious observance of the laws;* and they sent a secret message to King Agrippa, petitioning him to restrain Ananus from similar proceedings in future. . . . Some of them, moreover, went to meet Albinus on his way from Alexandria and explained that it was

* The Pharisees are clearly indicated.

illegal for Ananus to convene a meeting of the Sanhedrin without his consent." The result was that Ananus received a reprimand from Albinus and was deposed from his office by Agrippa. There is nothing remarkable about the Greek of this passage. The mannerisms of the amanuensis are absent because he has here ceased to lend his aid; but language and tone (especially the Pharisee's criticism of the Sadducees) are thoroughly Josephan.

The passage sufficiently shows that the writer's sympathies are with the " moderates " and Pharisees; just as from the other passage we may infer an attraction towards the Jews who flocked to hear the " good man " John, and a bias against Herod who met with " a very just retribution." James, it must be remembered, held a prominent position as head of the primitive church in Jerusalem.

These two passages lead us *a priori* to expect some mention—and not unfavourable mention —elsewhere of the founder of the movement " Him that was called Christ."

The " Testimonium." And so we turn to the controversial passage in the eighteenth book of the *Antiquities*, the so-called " testi-

mony '' to Christ. I had better read it, familiar as it will be to you:—

> '' Now about this time lived Jesus, a wise man, if indeed he should be called a man. For he was a doer of marvellous acts, a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure; and he won over to himself many Jews and many also of the Greek nation. He was the Christ. And when, on the indictment of the principal men among us, Pilate had sentenced him to the cross, yet did not those who had loved him at the first cease (to do so); for he appeared to them alive again on the third day, as the divine prophets had declared—these and ten thousand other wonderful things—concerning him. And even now the race (or ' tribe ') of Christians, so named from him, is not extinct.'' (*Ant.* xviii. 63f.)

This paragraph, as you will be aware, after being rejected, in whole or in part, by most modern critics, has recently been rehabilitated by two authorities of the first rank. Professor Burkitt in this country and, following him with a little hesitation, Harnack in Germany have pronounced it to be authentic. Over against

them are ranged such formidable antagonists as Schürer, Niese and Norden. Who shall decide where doctors of this calibre disagree? For myself, in a little volume of Selections* published three years ago I ventured to side with the latter group and to reject the passage as a Christian interpolation. Further study of Josephus and of Harnack's article, which has only recently come into my hands, has nearly convinced me that he and Professor Burkitt are right.

I must endeavour briefly to summarise the *pros* and *cons*, under the heads of external and internal evidence, the latter including context, style and subject-matter. In the forefront I will place the two items of evidence which are most damaging to the counsel for the defence.

External Evidence. First, then, as to the external evidence. The passage stands in all our MSS., but none of these is older than the 10th century. It existed already in the 4th century when Eusebius quotes it. Before him there is no certain trace of it; and this silence is strange. The *argumentum e silentio* cannot be pressed; yet one might expect that such wel-

* *Selections from Josephus*, S.P.C.K., 1919.

come testimony would be cited by early Christian apologists. But there is more than this. Origen, who found allusions in his Josephus to John the Baptist and James, not only does not quote the "Christ" passage, but uses such language as makes it difficult to suppose that it, or at least the words "He was the Christ," stood in his text. "The wonder is," he writes, "that though he (Josephus) *did not admit our Jesus to be Christ*, he none the less gave his witness to so much righteousness in James";* and again (writing on John the Baptist) "although he *disbelieved in Jesus as Christ*."† This is a very formidable argument against the authenticity, and due weight must be given to it. Had Origen only a perfunctory acquaintance with Josephus and did he overlook our passage? That is unlikely, since he gives an exact reference ("in the eighteenth book of the *Antiquities*") for the passage about John, which is separated by a few pages only from this one. On the other hand it may be asked, whence did Origen learn that Josephus "disbelieved in Jesus as Christ"? Was it merely from common knowledge or from

* Comm. in Matt. x. 17. † *Contra Cels.* i. 47.

the qualifying ὁ λεγόμενος ("so-called Christ") in the James passage? Perhaps we may rather infer, with Whiston, that he did find some statement about Christ in his text, and that his authority may be the very passage we are considering, or some form of it, from which the four words "This was the Christ" may have been absent. I shall have occasion to quote later what appears to be an echo of our passage elsewhere in Origen. Even the four words are capable of another meaning than the Christian one; and the whole tenor of the passage is, and would appear to Origen, more like that of an external observer than of a convert. That, though not a wholly satisfactory explanation, seems the best which can be given, if on other grounds the passage appears to be authentic.

Internal Evidence: (i) Context. Let us turn then to the internal evidence and first to the context, from which it cannot be isolated. This again *prima facie* suggests an adverse verdict. The paragraph seems to break the thread of the narrative, the framework of which consists at this point of a series of "riots," or "disturbances" (θόρυβοι). It is preceded

by two θόρυβοι and followed by two (or three) others. The noun θόρυβος or the verb θορυβεῖν occurs in each of them, and the opening words of the third "Now about the same time another calamity disturbed (ἐθορύβει) the Jews" seems to connect it directly with the second, leaving no room for our passage. The Christian movement itself was doubtless a θόρυβος, but it is not here so presented. This argument has been forcibly stated by Norden, and, independently of him, I attached and still attach great weight to it myself. But let us look a little closer. Norden maintains that the framework (a catena of θόρυβοι) was taken over from an older source. But he also admits that more than one source has been used; the θόρυβοι are not in chronological order. We have first riots (i) and (ii), caused by Pilate's high-handed actions during his term of office as procurator in Palestine (26-36 C.E.), followed by the Christ passage. Then (iii) there is a change of both scene and date, and we are given two scandalous stories about events in Rome which led first to the suppression of Isis-worship and then to the expulsion of the Jews.

These last events are stated by Tacitus (*Ann.* ii. 85) to have occurred in 19 C.E., *i.e* before Pilate became procurator; Josephus's source is undoubtedly Roman. Lastly (iv) we revert to Palestine and another rising, this time in Samaria, which led to Pilate's recall.

Josephus has used at least two sources. He has himself (if I interpret Norden aright) broken the original framework of a series of θόρυβοι in Palestine by inserting other stories about religious disturbances in Rome, one of which has nothing to do with the Jews. I see no reason why he should not also have broken it by the insertion (in one or other of his editions) of the more relevant passage about Christ. The objection raised under this head, though strong, is not insuperable.

(ii) Greek Style. Considering the marked peculiarities in the Greek of this portion of the *Antiquities*, one might expect the style to settle the question once for all. In fact, this criterion is not quite decisive, but, as I now think, just turns the scale in favour of the authenticity of the passage as a whole. Its brevity does not give much scope for the mannerisms of the secretary. But there *is* one phrase which

occurs repeatedly in Books xvii-xix and nowhere else in the work, ἡδονῇ δέχεσθαι, "to welcome." "The interpolator knew his author," says Norden. To this we may retort that, on Harnack's authority, ἡδονή in early Christian literature is used consistently in a bad sense; similarly no Christian, on the same authority, ever described his co-religionists, who abjured racial distinctions, as a "tribe" (φῦλον). Most of the phraseology can be illustrated from some part of our author's works. In particular I would mention the verb ἐπάγεσθαι for "to win converts," the neuter τὸ Ἑλληνικόν beside the masculine Ἰουδαίους (as in *B.J.* ii. 268), and "the principal men"; Norden's objection, that "our principal men" does not occur is, if the statement is correct, of little weight. A few other objections on the score of language which he urges disappear on fuller investigation. The only substantial objection raised is the occurrence of three instances of hiatus; but Norden himself admits a certain laxity in our author's practice in this respect in the *Antiquities*.

(iii) Contents and tone. Our decision must

rest primarily on such arguments as have already been adduced, not on any subjective opinion as to what Josephus could or could not have written. Yet the contents and tone of the passage have also to be considered. Strange as these may appear from either point of view, they are, perhaps, more compatible with Jewish, than with Christian, authorship.

If the words are a Christian interpolation, they are an *artistic* forgery. The writer has not been content to interpose a gloss in his own language, but has masqueraded under the mantle of the historian and by studying his author has endeavoured to palm off his composition upon him. He has, as we saw, not shrunk from using the words "pleasure" and "tribe" in an un-Christian sense. He has asserted that Jesus made many converts among the Greeks, whereas he must have known that his master's missionary activity was restricted to "the house of Israel." It would be hard to parallel such a literary forgery.

Harnack rightly, I think, detects two general characteristics in the tone of the passage: a calculated brevity and insincerity. It compresses a great deal into a brief space; it is a carefully

thought out statement, in which every word has been weighed. Again, it is insincere, diplomatic and patronising; the writer is not in earnest with his big phrases.

It must, however, be remembered that Josephus's works have come to us through Christian hands, by which the passage, though genuine as a whole, may have been slightly amplified Four outstanding difficult phrases claim final attention.

Difficult and doubtful phrases. "A wise man if one must call him a man." "A wise man"; so John Baptist is characterised as "a good man." But what is the alternative implied by "if one must call him a man"? That he may have been God? Not necessarily. The comparison suggested is rather, in Harnack's opinion, with one of the Greek heroes; "of godhead in our sense there is no idea." To confront the Greeks with a Jewish sage and wonder-worker of recent times was attractive to a sensation-loving writer. Whiston quotes from Origen a phrase which suggests that that Father may have known our passage after all. Immediately after quoting Josephus on James, Origen, in his discussion on "the brethren of

Jesus " and the words " Whence hath this man this wisdom?" (Matt. xiii. 54) remarks " And perhaps by these things is indicated a new doubt (in the minds of the Jews) concerning him, that Jesus was *not a man, but something more divine.*"*

" A teacher of men who receive *the truth* with pleasure." This does not commit the writer to an acknowledgement of all the articles of the Christian creed. He probably thinks of the Sermon on the Mount, which (Harnack is again my authority) always made a great impression on philosophical Jews and heathen.

" This was the Christ." These words may well be a Christian interpolation, but admit of defence. If they are genuine, " the Christ " (ὁ χριστός) probably means " that *Christus* of whom you have heard tell," and is equivalent to ὁ λεγόμενος χριστός of the James passage. The name, sometimes corrupted, as in a familiar passage in Suetonius, to *Chrestus*,† must have been well-known in Rome when Josephus wrote. The clause merely identifies the person intended, as else-

* Comm. in Matt. x. 17.

† Suet. *Claudius*. 25, " Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit."

where in Josephus—no fewer than twenty persons bearing this name appear in Niese's index. I should hesitate to go so far as Professor Burkitt, who interprets the words as meaning that Jesus was the Christ, but no more than a good man who was dead and gone; his followers were harmless folk like their master, quite unimportant and no danger to the state. Josephus is reticent on the subject of Messiah, but there are a few passages* which hint that he had not so "utterly stifled his messianic expectations" as the Professor suggests.

"For he appeared to them alive again on the third day, as the divine prophets had declared—these and ten thousand other wonderful things—concerning him." This clause again may conceivably be an interpolation; it is a parenthesis and the sentence is complete without it. Josephus retained the Pharisaic belief in a resurrection;† but the phrases πάλιν ζῶν and τρίτην ἔχων ἡμέραν cannot be exactly paralleled in his writings. The sequence of ideas suspiciously resembles that of a Christian creed, "crucified under Pontius

* See *Ant.* iv. 125 (on Balaam) and x. 210 (on Daniel).
† *Cf.* Ap. ii. 218.

Pilate, and the third day rose again according to the Scriptures." But, again, the language is cool and irreverent; and the hyperbole " ten thousand other wonderful things " is in the historian's manner.

On the whole, then, I would accept the authenticity, with a reservation as to the two last named clauses. What was the real conviction of Josephus it would be idle to conjecture. There is no ground for Whiston's belief that he was an Ebionite Christian; nor yet for Laqueur's fanciful idea that, when his success as an author was imperilled by the criticisms of Justus, he made overtures to the Christians by inserting this paragraph, and threw, not himself, but his *Antiquities* into their arms, to ensure their preservation. We can say no more than that he was half-heartedly attracted by the personality of one whose followers had shown such indomitable pertinacity. It required some courage to write even this brief testimony; a year later (assuming that the passage stood in the first edition) it would have required still more.

(F) Concluding Estimate

In conclusion, what estimate should we form of the man and his work? His defects are obvious:—egotism, opportunism, a lack of sincerity and depth. His own interests held the first place in his thoughts. He was not one to sacrifice his life in a great cause: no warlike liberator of his country like Judas Maccabæus, no Ezra or Johanan ben Zakkai to recreate a new Judaism on the ruins of the past. We may read his ambition in that phrase of Thucydides which caught his fancy, "aspiring to heroism"; but the heroic level was beyond his reach.

Yet, among his faults (as Dr. Israel Abrahams remarked in a recent Schewich lecture) a lack of patriotism cannot be reckoned. In his brief public career in Palestine he was a pacifist, without the strength of character to control the militants, who had no use for a mediator. Who indeed could have controlled those hot-heads? And who can say how the course of history might have been changed had his counsels prevailed? Involved in early man-

hood in the rush of momentous events, overwhelmed by a wave of national feeling, which had long been gathering force, which he could not stem and vainly strove to direct, recognising from the first the hopelessness of defiance to imperial Rome and anxiously seeking to avert catastrophe by compromise; he, nevertheless, when invested with an important command, threw himself into the task of organising, to the best of his ability, the defences of Galilee, so long as resistance was possible. And then, after the *débacle*, when his position might have tempted him to disown his nation, he devoted the energies of his later life to writing its history and championing its cause against the slanders of a malignant world. He has surely earned the name of patriot.

A patriot, yet always unpopular. In this second phase of his career, as apologist and historian, he was still out of touch with his nation. A client of the hated Flavian conquerors, aspiring to take rank with the great pagan historians, he was now a cosmopolitan, whose orthodoxy and alien methods were suspect. His *Apologia* was framed on un-Jewish lines. *Non tali auxilio*, his countrymen

might have said. His Greek models, had the source and extent of all that borrowed finery been known, must have been as repugnant to them as were the temples and games of Herod the Great to their forefathers.

In a sense, I suppose, Josephus may be regarded as a pioneer of Liberal Judaism. At the parting of the ways the school of Jamnia took one road, consolidating and building up a code which tended to keep the nation aloof from the world. Josephus took another.

He has left us one admirable work, the merits of which, to my mind, improve on nearer acquaintance. His fame might rank higher, if it rested on the *Jewish War* alone, had he been content to remain *homo unius libri*. His larger work is less satisfying; yet our loss would be great had we been deprived of the *Antiquities*. The compiler's assiduity has preserved an immense amount of valuable material. In particular, for that pregnant period at the beginning of our era, he gives us the framework without which no modern "history of the Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ" could ever have been written.

[Reference throughout the above is to Niese's text of *Josephus* and to the short paragraphs into which he divided it.

Recent literature on the passage relating to Christ.—

(*a*) For the authenticity of the whole section:—

F. C. Burkitt in *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, Leiden, 1913, pp. 135 ff.

A. Harnack in *Internat. Monatsschrift für Wissenschaft und Technik*, 1913, pp. 1037 ff.

W. E. Barnes, *The Testimony of Josephus to Jesus Christ*, London, S.P.C.K., 1920.

(*b*) For partial interpolation.

Th. Reinach in *Revue des Études Juives*, tom. xxxv 1897, pp. 1 ff.

P. Corrsen in *Zeitschrift für die N.T. Wissenschaft*, 1914 pp. 114 ff., *Die Zeugnisse des Tacitus u. Pseudo-Josephus über Christus* (thinks the interpolation has probably replaced a genuine statement of Josephus about Christ).

(*c*) Against the authenticity of the whole section:—

E. Norden in *Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum*, vol. xxxi, 1913, pp. 637 ff., *Josephus u. Tacitus über Jesus Christus und eine messianische Prophetie.*

E. Schürer, *Hist. of Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ*, 1898, I. 2, pp. 143 ff. (where the older literature is quoted).]

Printed by MACKAYS LTD., Chatham.

DATE DUE

BM 177 .U6

776

Union of Jewish Literary Societies.

Judaism and the beginnings of Christianity

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BM177.U6
Union of Jewi Judaism and the beginnings
3 0645 0009 2547 5